The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME X | New York, Saturday, March 31, 1917 | Number 126

Contents

Editorial Notes 243

Leading Editorials
- The Background of American Hesitation 246
- The Larger American Strategy 248
- A War Program for Liberals 249
- The Supreme Court's Power 250

General Articles
- America Prepares ..... William Hard 253
- Dimension in Language ..... George Soule 255
- Growth of Federalism ..... Charles Merz 256
- German Tariff Plans 259

At the Capitol ..... C. M. 261

Socialists Enunciate New Principles 262

Correspondence 263

Books and Things ..... P. L. 267

After the Play ..... A. S. J. 268

Reviews of Books
- The Morning After ..... F. H. 269
- The New Commonwealth ..... H. J. L. 270
- A Modernist Let Loose ..... H. J. L. 273
- The Basic Problem 276

THE Journal de Genève states that Germany's peace terms are as follows: Evacuation of France, except the mining district of Briey, in exchange for a channel port (Calais or Dunkirk) and an indemnity of 15,000,000,000 francs; restoration of Belgium except that Belgium is not to be allowed to have a national army, permanent German garrisons in Namur, Liège and Antwerp, control of Belgian railroads and ports, and favorable treatment in an economic treaty. We are able to say that the source of this information is reliable, and that the Journal de Genève is substantially correct in its statements, though they are incomplete. The German government is not yet prepared to renounce conquest, and the refusal to reveal her terms last January was due to knowledge on Germany's part that a statement of them would consolidate belligerent and neutral opinion against her. Her hope was to secure a conference, detach imperial Russia, and then extort these conquests from the isolated western Powers. That is why the conference Germany proposed was impossible, and why President Wilson's request for an announcement of German policy was so gruffly rejected.

GERMANY does not by any means consider herself beaten. Of this her calmness in the face of the threatened accession of the United States to the ranks of her enemies is one indication. Another indication is her wanton destruction of everything standing within the territory she has evacuated in France. This was frightfulness, but not the mad frightfulness of a nation in despair. Germany has recently split Belgium into two administrative districts, evidence that she still hopes to be sufficiently victorious to cut Belgium into two nations. On what does the German confidence of victory rest? Partly, no doubt, upon what Germans regard as the success of the submarine campaign. Ships are still going down at a rate far exceeding the rate of construction. But in all probability what most heartens the Germans is their anticipation of the results of the terrific blow they are preparing to inflict upon the new Russian republic. We need not imagine that the downfall of the Czar wholly disrupted the net of secret influences the Germans were weaving about Russia. The greater number of intriguers are still at large, some doubtless in posts of influence, ready to profit to the utmost by any disaster that the armies of the republic may suffer. Probably Germany overestimates the power of her system of intrigue, just as she overestimated its power in the United States and Mexico and Japan. To underestimate this power, however, will not profit Germany's foes.

THE United States will in the near future be faced with the colossal task of organizing for war. Even fifty years ago a nation could prepare for war without making any very radical changes in industrial and political methods, or in the balance of social and economic powers, but such is no longer the case. Preparation for war now demands thoroughgoing administrative and industrial reorganization; and this reorganization will have to be particularly drastic in the United States because of the American political and industrial mechanism which has been determined by wholly different needs. It is likely to introduce

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

revolutionary changes into American political and social economy. It is certain to bring to the surface a series of problems about the relation between employers and wage-earners, capitalist and labor organizations, politics and administration, the comparative value of centralized and decentralized administration, and so on, which need to be carefully studied and so far as possible understood. In order to assist us in making these studies and in placing their results before our readers, The New Republic has added to its list of regular contributors Mr. William Hard, who has done so much brilliant and thorough work along analogous lines for other periodicals. Mr. Hard will prepare a series of articles dealing primarily with the program of organizing for war but also dealing with the new facts in such a way as to bring out their relation to a better social and industrial organization in times of peace.

THE railways are demanding a general advance in rates. What percentage of advance they want is not specified. This will come later when the question of principle has been adequately discussed. It is urged that gross earnings, indicating service performed, are steadily increasing. Costs of labor, fuel, materials, etc., are increasing even more rapidly, with the result that net earnings are declining. It follows of necessity that railway credit suffers and that it is impossible to obtain the new capital needed for extensions and new equipment. The condition is obviously one demanding a remedy, but it does not follow that a general advance in rates, with no restrictions upon the application of the increased earnings, is the remedy indicated. No advance in rates that would be tolerated could make new railway issues compete on favorable terms with the issues of industrial companies harvesting war profits. Nor could such an advance overcome the influence upon the market of the return of foreign-held railway securities, of which there is still a billion dollars' worth, market value, ready to take advantage of any temporary boom here. Some of the increased earnings might be applied directly to the improvement of railway facilities, but this process would offer no speedy relief of the problem of congestion. Furthermore, there is serious objection to a kind of financing that makes the public pay directly for improving properties that the state will later, perhaps, be compelled to buy in at full value. If the railways are ready to offer a plan whereby increased earnings granted will be devoted to paying income on securities to be issued exclusively for the financing of improvements, their request can hardly be denied. Such securities could be made to yield returns sufficiently high to attract capital even under the present condition of dearth of investment funds.

THE temporary and voluntary censorship rules recently proposed by the administration to fill in the gap until Congress can legislate on the subject exhibit astonishingly little understanding of the workings of the press. "It is requested," they say, "that no information, reports or rumors attributing a policy to the government in any international situation, not authorized by the President, or a member of the Cabinet, be published without consulting the Department of State." These rules would be intelligible if the President had not perforce denied himself to nearly everyone and even terminated his weekly conferences with the newspapermen; if Cabinet members were not reluctant to speak on questions outside their own department, even for guidance; if there were only a handful, instead of scores, of correspondents restlessly searching for news at every minute of the day and until three o'clock in the morning; if all officials of the State Department, except the Secretary and the Councilor, were not practically forbidden to speak, except on their own narrow subjects; and if the world were not daily throwing up hundreds of questions for treatment by the Washington correspondents, who in turn are writing against the clock and not for history. The rule is absurd because it will be unavoidably and incessantly violated, and it is dangerous because it may be adopted as a guidance for congressional legislation.

THE United States is a democracy; perhaps, if you like, a newspaper democracy, curious, insistent on its right to know, and impatient of suppression of facts. The country wants to follow the administration through each successive step of a crisis; to know, to speculate, and to be ready to help. Hitherto the very highest officials of the administration have not only not understood, but have even deplored this curiosity, in the belief that they should be left alone till they were ready to make an official announcement. Yet this appetite for news is wholesome and natural. Only as a result of being freely and candidly informed as to the purposes of the administration is any understanding or control of foreign policy by public opinion possible. What the administration now needs is not less but more publicity. The silence which has allowed a benevolent neutrality to continue unknown during two and a half years should give way to frankness. The government instead of surrounding itself with a censorship as tight as any in the world, should lay its full case before the country. The correspondents in Washington

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are ready and able to become the administration's right hand, but only in case they are used, trusted and guided. Probably no greater injury towards public opinion and an America united for the large world purposes just appearing on the horizon could be done than by formal adoption of some of the wholly unworkable censorship rules now threatening the country.

A TALENT for interesting the public is one of Leonard Wood's great gifts. He can stimulate and sustain confidence in his ability. Hence his shift to the comparative obscurity of the Southeastern Department at Charleston, South Carolina, has naturally aroused not only resentment from his immediate friends, but disquietude among disinterested outsiders who have attached importance to his initiative and his soldierly qualities. Much of the belief in Wood is well founded; some of it is the result of his talent as a self-exploiter; and some of it wholly leaves out of account the defects and limitations of the man. His shift is undoubtedly due to the irritation he has excited in the administration. During his entire army career General Wood has always been skating on the thin ice of insubordination. He is so preoccupied with ends, and usually highly important public ends, that not infrequently he has disregarded the means which a good officer should take to reach them. A deeper reason for distrust can be found in his militaristic tendency. When he speaks his mind as he does to university audiences he shows, without reserve, that he does not understand or sympathize with democratic organization and policy, that he does not regard the army merely as one of the necessary police instruments in the service of a humaner organization of society, both at home and abroad. These are the defects of the man, and they are very serious defects. They undoubtedly decided the administration to side-track General Wood, and to that extent justified the action. But the administration unfortunately left out of reckoning certain counter-considerations which should have been decisive on the eve of war.

GENERAL WOOD is, as a matter of fact, one of less than a handful of army officers with the necessary energy, imagination, experience and resourcefulness to deal with the problems immediately ahead. Instead of blunting his powers of mischief by paralyzing his power for good, the administration would have done better to have tried to use the latter for the benefit of the country. Instead of moving Wood to Charleston he should be moved to headquarters at Washington and ordered to help in the colossal work of organization which will have to be undertaken. There all his faults could be held in check and his great powers put to good use. It was just in such a way that Lincoln used recalcitrant but indispensable material in the Civil War.

THE New York World's proposal of a billion dollar gift to France is unanswerable. If France will accept it, she will do this nation a great service by enabling us to lift our rôle in the war to the plane on which we wish to fight. It would be an immediate demonstration that we do not intend to make this a private war in behalf of mere American rights on sea. The billion dollars would go to France in the product of American soil and labor. They would be not a heap of gold but a free service. In giving this to France we should want it understood that the sum was not to be considered either as payments for the past or as a measure of our assistance in the present. A billion dollars happens to be a convenient sum with which to start, but once at war absolutely all the resources of the nation will be available against Germany. The World's suggestion is sound policy and fine feeling, and ought to be adopted enthusiastically. We wish that another proposal could be coupled with it. The American government should offer to share equally with France and Britain the cost of Belgian relief. This is an obligation of honor that must not be neglected. The relief organization which a few Americans have created should now be sustained by the whole American people.

BILLY SUNDAY'S spiritual offensiveness is bad enough, but the ugliest part of it is the elaborate machinery by which he is to be foisted on a great community that has no real heart or stomach for him. The preparations for his descent on New York have been going on for months. The clergy that have assented to his coming are laying themselves out in every possible way to divert their congregations to his tabernacle, and every known device will be employed to cook up interest in him and drum up audiences. The most irrational and ridiculous aspect of the revival is the connection it promises to have with recruiting. Billy Sunday is to avail of all the mob feeling that is stirring in New York next month and to turn his handsprings and deliver his verbal spit-balls for country as well as God. Whatever its by-products, this is a sort of barbarism which most newspaper editors despise, and it would be exceedingly wholesome for the clergymen who have crawled on the Billy Sunday band-wagon if the New York papers prove to them that the way to reinstate Jesus is not by vulgarizing him.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Background of American Hesitation

ACCORDING to all appearances a state of war will during the next few days be declared to exist between the United States and Germany. In spite of the profound reluctance of the American people to become entangled in what the majority of them regard as an essentially European quarrel, in spite of the extremely pacific disposition of the President and his party, the German submarine campaign has forced the United States into the war by the inexorable logic of its own situation and purposes. It could not agree wholly to withdraw its flag from the high seas at the bidding of an international aggressor. It could not insist on neutral rights against both belligerents without doing more harm to the Allies than to Germany and without in effect assisting Germany to win the war. Unless, consequently, it was to abandon any title to be consulted about the system of law and government which was to prevail on the high seas during war, it must oppose German aggression with armed resistance. That is the course which all of their reluctance to enter the war, all of their deeply rooted pacifism, all of their tradition and pride of neutral independence, has not enabled the American people to avoid.

In the meantime they have been undecided and perplexed; and their indecision and perplexity has annoyed and troubled people who did not share it. Many Englishmen and Frenchmen with the usual impulse of one nation to attribute the worst of motives to another have regarded it with contempt as the irresolution of cowardice; and this charitable judgment has prevailed particularly among Canadians who might have been expected to understand, even if they did not share, the psychology of their southern neighbors. The same judgment has been passed upon their fellow-countrymen by certain Americans at dinner parties in London, Boston, Chicago and New York; and many other Americans, although they resented the hasty condemnation of foreigners and of their hyphenated fellow-countrymen, were themselves irritated and disquieted by the ignorance and indifference of so much American public opinion and by the kind of sacrifices which it was apparently willing to make for peace. The shrinking from war, in face of the insistent provocation by Germany and of her violation of American hospitality, seemed to them an evidence of national moral enervation.

Now that the hesitation is over, even though a good deal of the perplexity remains, it is worth while to make a new and more careful attempt to understand it. The American people have had many excuses for hesitation and perplexity, which have been ignored and misinterpreted by their critics; and not the least of these excuses has been the nature and source of the most conspicuous propaganda in favor of war. Those who wanted it tried to urge their country on for reasons which ignored American traditions and habits of thought and which took no account of the divisions and classifications of American public opinion on domestic issues. The class which was most eager to fight for liberalism in Europe happens to be the class which has been most indifferent or hostile to liberalism in America; and many of this class at the very moment when they were most exalted by the idea of joining the western democracies in resistance to German autocracy were themselves betraying an impatient enmity to the normal processes of democracy in their own country. Popular irresolution was intensified rather than assuaged by the attitude and arguments which the most headstrong of Americans used to overcome it. If they had dictated the policy of the government, some national moral enervation might have been avoided, but only at a cost of dangerous internal friction. In so far as the country is united at the present time, its unity must be attributed to Mr. Wilson's method of allowing the dogmatic opposition to war to be gradually dissipated by its own futility and of allowing the feeling of the inevitability and necessity of war to accumulate until it became irresistible. He may recently have overworked his Fabian tactics, but in dealing with the irresolution, the division and perplexities of American opinion since the sinking of the Lusitania it was on the whole a sounder method than that of stimulating opposition by an appearance of seeking war. Even Mr. Bryan has recently subsided.

The roots of the American reluctance to participate actively in the war run very deep. They are buried in the varied origin of American racial stocks, in the nature and limits of American national experience, and in the extent to which genuinely super-national sympathies and ideas have been wrought into the national consciousness. The popular irresolution has implied an instinctive insight into one aspect of the intricate and tragic meaning of the war which the bellicose pro-Ally sympathizers have overlooked. In the eyes of the latter the war has raised no issue which an American needs to consider except that between the violators and defenders of Belgium; between Germany as the enemy of democratic progress and France and Great Britain as its friends. But the American popular consciousness knew better. It sympathized with the French and English and their cause, but it also sympathized with the sufferings of the peoples of Europe as a whole, irrespective somewhat of their national animosities

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and their divergent war-cries. While groups of Americans have felt passionately the need of fighting on one side, American popular consciousness has been reflecting all sides. It was dominated by a strong and instinctive repulsion to the results of reproducing in this country the full enormity of the European schism, and this repulsion was the expression of an essential national interest. The future of American democracy is tied up with that of organized and purposive internationalism. Unlike the great European nations this political catholicism is in America not merely an ideal, but a living thing, which has been wrought by its history and its institutions into the fabric of the national life. If the quarrel which has divided the European nations against one another were reconstituted in this country without any change of spirit or outlook, it would certainly and fatally divide the composite and humanistic American democracy against itself and lead to ultimate national disintegration.

Few Americans are very explicitly aware of the extent to which their attitude towards the war has been determined by the actual existence and the future need of political catholicism. Those who have most wished to stay out of the war have usually considered it as an unmitigated and essentially meaningless calamity, to be shunned much as one would shun a leper's colony. Those who have most wished to go in have regarded it as a morality play, staged for the exclusive purpose of circumventing the devil and vindicating a necessary connection between victory and righteousness. But American opinion while it has been influenced by both of these attitudes has not been satisfied with either. Its dissatisfaction has assumed the form of puzzled scepticism rather than an actual formulation of its own opinions, but if that opinion were formulated, it would conclude by regarding the war as in a very real sense the greatest tragedy as yet enacted in the history of the world.

The war is the greatest tragedy in history not because it is the most stupendous calamity in history. The decline and fall of the Roman Empire was an even more stupendous calamity. It cost humanity a larger measure of desolation and suffering. The war is supremely tragic because the desolation and suffering is authorized by the statutes of the modern world and outlawed by its ideals, because European statesmanship is reduced to the awful program of prolonging indefinitely the existence of the agony in the professed hope of preventing its repetition. It is utterly tragic because never before in the history of the world has so much goodwill and loyalty, so much disinterested self-dedication, so much potential enthusiasm for human welfare, such a high degree of technical skill, scientific knowledge and coöperative organization, so many of those impulses, gifts and attainments which are capable of contributing to the fulfillment of human life—being devoted to its frustration. It is consequently more than a disaster. It belongs to the class of sinful yet fateful errors which strip civilization bare of its subterfuges and leave it face to face with the intolerable consequences of its own ultimate delinquencies.

The conception of the European war as a tragedy which embodies the dilemma of modern civilization helps to explain both why the American people have been irresolute and perplexed about going in, and why the irresolution has been overcome even though the perplexity persists. If the war were chiefly a colossal but accidental calamity, they might, as the pacifists claim, avoid the suffering and the dangers by refusing to participate. Or if it were chiefly a transparent opportunity for the exhibition of moral bravado, they could not decently and honorably refuse to participate, but by their participation they would only be adding another cohort to the army of the Lord, and they would have no right to march and halt under their own orders. If, however, it is a tragedy with a meaning which needs to be understood and expiated by the people of all the great modern nations, yet a meaning which is still in the making, there would be a different, if not a better reason for American participation. The American nation would then be intervening not because the Allies were fighting our battles, or because we wished to fight theirs, but because by fighting our own battle in their company we would assume our own share in the common delinquency and danger. We would not be renouncing the part of a fascinated and fearful spectator merely to assume that of a morally energetic supernumerary. Our participation would have at least a chance of altering the action of the tragedy and of adding something to its meaning.

If, then, we are to participate in the war, let us do so with the intention of adding to the action something of our own—something besides American money, guns, ships, and soldiers, something besides the mutilated and dead bodies of American youth. There is a chance that our contribution, while it will not make the tragedy any less intolerable, may make its repetition less probable and less costly. Although the United States shares with the nations of Europe the delinquency which has involved the civilized world in this disaster, although like them it has organized its domestic life with the callous indifference to popular welfare, although like them it has neglected the problem of securing results beneficial to all nations from the action of motives satisfactory to a patri-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

otic individual and national conscience, still the United States does possess one fortuitous but important advantage over the European nations. It is the completest illustration in the modern world of surplus political value—of political value which like the surplus economic value of modern industry belongs to society and needs to be distributed in order to be redeemed and preserved. Its situation enables it to be comparatively safe without becoming dangerously powerful. Its ideals and experience have prevented its nationalism from being aggressive and from becoming incompatible with political catholicism. By associating its participation in the war with a federal and catholic international ideal it can give to such an ideal a wholly unprecedented standing in the counsels of nations. By abandoning its own exclusiveness it can enormously advance the general cause of federal interdependence. It will not escape thereby the necessity of a drastic process of domestic purging. But it will at least neither shirk its share of a dilemma which is involved in the very nature of our modern secular political civilization, nor will it by entering, as so many Americans fear, be merely interfering in other people's quarrels and acting as a rubber stamp to the other people's projects. It will be entering to play a part which will become more important as the tragedy draws to an end, which can be written in part out of its own purposes, which could not be played by any other nation, and the lack of which, if it is not written and played, will obscure much of the significance of the tragedy.

The Larger American Strategy

MR. ROOSEVELT'S warning that we must not fight a "dollar war" needs to be supplemented by the warning that we must not fight a sentimental war, nor a superfluous war, nor a catch-phrase war, nor a war of empty gestures. The first business before us is so clear that it is mere confusion of thought to label it with some moralist's phrase. The United States must insure the communications to France and England. If they are cut we are impotent. We can raise armies and make munitions without end—if they cannot be transported to Europe they are a dead loss. This is what Germany is counting upon. She believes quite correctly that if she can destroy the world's shipping faster than it can be built, it doesn't matter how many new enemies there are overseas. Germany could ask nothing better of us than that we should turn our attention from the shipping question, on the theoretical ground that it wasn't heroic. We couldn't make a worse exhibition of ourselves than to forget the simple commonsense of the situation, and lose interest in the intensely prosaic but absolutely fundamental need for a vast supply of ships.

This is so obvious that it ought hardly to be necessary to say it. Yet a reading of editorials and speeches by men who are most anxious to have America play a big part discloses no realization of this first principle of sound strategy. If we really had our eye on the job the front pages of the newspapers would be filled with plans for increasing ship yards, for making standardized parts of ships in the nation's factories, for increasing and safeguarding the food supply. We should be planning to divert skilled labor, engineering resources, and organizing ability from automobile factories and the like to the making of ships. We should not worry five minutes whether this was dollar war or feeble war, because we would know that it is the weapon by which the defeat of Germany can be insured. Only if the submarine is checked can America's power be used. If the Atlantic highway is blockaded the Allies are cut off from their ultimate base of supplies. With that highway open the chances of German victory are ended.

There exists a certain demand in the country that a small expeditionary force should go to Europe at once. It would be purely symbolic. Properly trained it might hold two or three miles of trench on a quiet portion of the lines. Its real value would be political and moral, not military. The little army could be paraded through London and Paris as a visible sign of American coöperation, and would strengthen the Allied morale, but in itself it would make no difference in the summer's fighting. It is in fact a gesture, not a deed, and if it diverted energy and interest from the less thrilling but infinitely more important part of America's work in the war it might even be a handicap to the common cause. If excitement and devotion were centered upon it to the neglect of ships, munitions and food, if we became more interested in the glory in Europe than in the task of organization at home, we should be hurting ourselves more than the enemy.

If such a force is to go, it should be sent after full debate on the political consequences. Since it would be symbolic what would it symbolize? Certainly not a complete acceptance by America of the whole Allied program in Europe, for no one knows in detail what that program is. It could not mean that we were committing ourselves to all the minor entanglements into which the Allies have been forced by the necessities of war. No American army in Europe could be permitted to share responsibility for the obscure aims of Italian im-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perialism, or for the muddle in Greece, or for the partitioning of Turkey, or even for the reconquest of the whole of Alsace-Lorraine. We have been drawn into the war to resist Germany's aggression against international order. We are the enemies of the present German government because its purposes and its methods make a society of nations impossible. For us the terrible example of all that is detestable in Imperial Germany's political aims is summed up in Belgium. It was the crime against Belgium which made us anti-German in this war. It was what that crime revealed which caused us to adopt a benevolent neutrality in the past. It is because of what Belgium means that liberals would rather have war with Germany than suspend a single right upon the ocean which might help Germany to profit by her aggression.

Obviously the place for an American army to fight is alongside the Belgian army and preferably on Belgian soil. Then it would symbolize the thing we are fighting for. It would remain disentangled from any of the national aims which necessarily inspire the French and British armies. But before such a force is sent there ought to be a very clear and open understanding with the Allies. It should be definitely settled that we wish to be represented on that battlefront because the kind of world we want to live in is impossible if Belgium is not freed and restored. In return we should ask a pledge from the Allies that they will assist us in defending the integrity of Pan-America. By such reciprocal guaranties and pledges of aid, America's participation in the war can be made genuinely international, and a league of liberal nations brought definitely into existence. A joint protection by Britain, France, Italy, Russia and America of Belgium and the Latin states of this hemisphere would form a powerful international nucleus. It is now clearly within the scope of practical statesmanship.

There remains the question, not of a symbolic army to be sent immediately, but of a real army that might be used in eight months or a year. That we must raise such an army and begin training it at once is clear. All of the spring and summer will be needed to do it. But no commitment should be made now as to whether this army is to go or not. Sometime during the next months there will either be a decision on the battlefield or another deadlock. Then it will be somebody's duty to ask all the belligerents for a statement of terms. With our resources mobilized, with a fresh army ready, it will be in large measure for us to say whether the war should continue. If there has been a liberalization of the German government peace will not be too difficult. If Germany offers to abandon all the occupied territory, if the new Russia seems strong, our power to guide negotiations would be very great. This at least is certain, that no one can now foresee the situation at the end of the summer, and the duty of America is to have an army ready but to keep a free hand about the use of it.

To preserve this much independence of action is essential. There are few Americans who would be willing to surrender it, and the administration will speak the true will of the people if it insists that before pledging America to full participation in the war on land there must be a definition and justification of territorial, dynastic and commercial aims. Every other nation in joining the Allies has asked something for itself. All we can ask is the pledge of a scientific settlement before American troops are heavily engaged in Europe. We can ask nothing less than this. There is in it nothing sordid, nothing unmanly, nothing of which we need be anything but proud. It is the way of self-respect, for no one honors a nation that can be used for purposes it does not understand. It is a program which only the war-mad will denounce. The European democracies will understand it and approve.

A War Program for Liberals

WE print elsewhere in this issue a statement by a group of prominent American socialists. Its main assumptions are that comparatively liberal nations may justly be called on to fight on aggressive imperialism, that the international aim of democracies must be a league of nations, that armaments and armies should be organized on a democratic basis, and that profiteering should be eliminated from the making of munitions. With this general point of view The New Republic can most heartily agree, though much is omitted from the program which needs to be kept in mind if the war which is now upon us is to be liberal in purpose and method. We submit, therefore, a tentative set of principles for American liberals in wartime.

1. The first and most important from every point of view is the need for constant subordination of strategy to political aims. The real danger of the war psychology is to forget where you are going but to go furiously on your way. This is the path that leads to disastrous entanglement and to merely blind fighting. It is the business of liberalism to insist by the most drastic criticism that "defense" shall not become the mask for a mere process of running amuck and refusing to think. In the situation America is now facing this is peculiarly important. Unless the world emerges from this war a more liberal and a more peaceful

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

world America is beaten no matter how badly Germany is crushed. We have absolutely nothing to gain from the war except international security, no imperial ambitions in the Near East, no lost provinces to reconquer, no strategic points that we desire. Our relation to our Allies is therefore necessarily discriminating, and the task of American diplomacy is to coöperate with those groups in the other nations which are working for a "scientific peace."

2. In order that America can do this difficult thing it is essential to maintain freedom of political discussion to a far greater degree than it has been maintained in any country in Europe. A censorship will be necessary, but it should be under civilian control. A certain minimum of secrecy will be required, but that secrecy should be strictly confined to war measures. Political discussion must under no circumstances be suppressed even though some of it is inconvenient. The nation can not do its work if it depends merely upon a "patriotic" press.

3. Radicals are immediately concerned in administrative efficiency. If the war is feebly and wastefully conducted, if there is a vast amount of lost motion and tangle, not only is the human cost of war vastly increased, but a state of panic is certain to result. Liberalism can control the situation only by showing a mastery of it. To act swiftly on a large plan by sure method will not only shorten the war, but keep the conduct of the war out of the hands of the jingoes.

4. It is impossible merely to "nationalize munitions' manufacture," as this socialist manifesto urges, because munitions of war are not made in arsenals alone. In modern war, railroads, mines, machine shops, shipyards, clothing factories, and even farms make munitions. A better formula it seems to us is to work for nationalization of all important economic resources. By nationalization we mean government regulation of output, prices, profits, and labor conditions.

5. Of supreme importance to liberals is the method of financing war. On grounds of sheer business expediency as well as just distribution of burdens, it ought to be a cardinal principle that war is to be paid for in the largest practicable measure by immediate conscription of income. Liberals should work for the most fearless taxation of large incomes and war profits. Specially heavy taxation should be put upon luxurious expenditure, upon retinues of servants, motor cars, yachts. In the interest of economy as well as democracy it is important to cut off the expenditure on conspicuous waste.

6. In the process of nationalizing industries, liberals must insist for the sake of national unity as well as democracy that organized labor be treated as a national institution, and everything done to encourage the more complete unionization of labor. In return for the relaxation of labor's obstructive policies, the government must make the protection and improvement of working standards a national policy.

7. Liberals must fight to resist every effort to skimp on funds for education, research, and community progress. War is costly, but Europe's experience shows that the financial resources of a great nation are greater than any one had imagined. For us to enfeeble the next generation on the pretext of economy would be criminal folly, and should not for an instant be tolerated. Instead of retrenchment, there should be a vast expansion of educational opportunity and means for scientific research.

8. In advocating universal military training, it is essential for liberals to remember that they must not forge a weapon that a reactionary government could use blindly to play the old-fashioned diplomatic game. By insisting that there be no conscription for overseas service, no conscription in case of strike, by demanding a breakdown of the officers' caste, the necessary safeguards may be found. Liberals will for the present want a population trained to arms, but no government yet established on earth can be trusted with the power to conscript men into the battle line without the special sanction of the people's representatives. Compulsory training, compulsory service to defend the national territory, no compulsion to serve against the home population, and no compulsion, except in special emergency and by special legislation to serve outside American territory—this seems to us the compromise which the situation requires.

On some such program as this, American liberals, if they are united and effective, may be able to maintain democracy at home and contribute to internationalism in the world.

The Supreme Court's Power

TO anyone who is satisfied with the present system of judicial review of legislation, we recommend a careful study of the opinions of the members of the Supreme Court who dissented from the recent decision sustaining the Adamson law. They express, with unusual candor, the grounds on which four of the nine members of the court were willing to annul a statute which a large majority of Congress had deemed essential to public safety. That they express the views of justices who happen in this case to be in the minority does not lessen their importance. Only two weeks be-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fore, the same court, again by a five to four decision, had sustained the Washington workmen's compensation and state insurance law; but two of the members who were of the majority in the Adamson law case dissented in the Compensation case. Only three members of the court, Justices Holmes, Brandeis and Clark, voted to sustain both laws. Six members considered at least one of these pieces of social legislation a violation of due process of law.

The dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Day is the more interesting because it is the view of a man who has generally been aligned with the more liberal wing of the Supreme Court, and whose attitude toward social legislation has been sympathetic. Mr. Justice Day conceded that Congress could constitutionally pass a wage law. "I am not prepared to deny to Congress, in view of its constitutional authority to regulate commerce among the states, the right to fix by lawful enactment the wages to be paid to those engaged in such commerce in the operation of trains carrying passengers and freight. While the railroads of the country are privately owned, they are engaged in a public service, and because of that fact are subject in a large measure to governmental control." He dissented because he conceived that Congress had not sufficiently investigated and deliberated, because its judgment in the controversy was rendered without the information requisite to a just decision. "Inherently, such legislation requires that investigation and deliberation shall precede action." There should be opportunity to be heard, and an adjudication based on a full consideration of the interests of carriers, of employees, and of the public.

Conceding, for the sake of argument, the truth of this criticism of the way in which the Adamson law was enacted, does it not involve an extraordinary conception of the function of a judiciary in a democratic republic? Is it any of the court's affair whether Congress deliberates briefly or at length, whether it acts on full information or on inspiration? Mr. Justice Day's opinion involves the dangerous fallacy of looking on the settlement of a wage dispute as a purely judicial function, a more or less mechanical search for a discoverable truth, an adjudication of what a cognizable standard of justice requires. It attributes to Congress the functions and the limitations of a court, which can act only on evidence legally before it and after hearing and argument. That as able and progressive a mind as that of Mr. Justice Day should apply this judicial standard to Congress is amazing. For plainly what is a just wage is not a judicial question. Essentially, it is a political question, even though its details may be susceptible of judicial adjustment. And Congress is not expected to treat it judicially, as a court decides a controversy between two litigants. Congress is composed of men elected because they hold certain convictions, certain predisposed and proclaimed views of public policy. It is of the very essence of democracy that these views should guide them to a decision.

When President Wilson asked Congress to enact the Adamson law, he put his request on the ground that the conscience of the community approved the basic eight-hour standard, and was willing to concede this part of the Brotherhoods' demands as a condition of peace. Congress, in touch with a vitally affected constituency, agreed with him. Is the Supreme Court competent to say that the President and Congress misinterpreted the public conscience? Or that they did not sufficiently investigate and deliberate upon it? In any rational scheme of governmental division of labor, can a body of nine lawyers, necessarily out of touch with the sources of public opinion, necessarily confined to ardous legal labors, appointed for life and responsible to no popular constituency, can such a body of men safely be allowed to supervise Congress in its duty of interpreting the will of the people?

The opinion of Mr. Justice Pitney proceeds on very different grounds. It is a supreme example of what Roscoe Pound has felicitously termed "mechanical jurisprudence." By strictly logical deduction, by what appears to be a cold intellectual process, it builds up a system of legal "rights," deduced from principles of liberty and property, and demonstrates that they are incompatible with the Adamson law. The right of property includes a category of constituent rights, "the right to control, to manage, and dispose of it [property], the right to put it at risk in business, and by legitimate skill and enterprise to make gains beyond the fixed rates of interest, the right to hire employees, to bargain freely with them about the rate of wages, and from their labors to make lawful gains. . . ." The right to bargain as to wages, by logical deduction, implies the right to refuse any terms that may be offered. "It is of the very essence of the right that the parties may remain in disagreement if either party is not content with any term proposed by the other." These rights, thus logically delimited, are protected by the Constitution against all legislation which does not fall within a well defined category of laws relating to health, safety and morals. The same formal logic is apparent in the treatment of the question of interstate commerce. The opinion quotes with approval, as applicable to the Adamson law, Justice Harlan's statement in the Adair case, that the law there in question could have no "possible legal or logical connection" with interstate commerce, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that " in itself and in the eye of the law " it has no bearing on the traffic with which the employee is connected. Wage legislation, Mr. Justice Pitney points out, cannot affect commerce by making employees more contented and more efficient, because it puts no legal obligation on them to become more contented or efficient. " The increase affected is not at all conditioned upon contented or efficient service. It benefits alike those who are efficient and those who are not." " The suggestion that it was passed to prevent a threatened strike, and in this sense to remove an obstruction from the path of commerce, while true in fact, is immaterial in law."

This method of solving constitutional questions by formal logic was popular a decade ago, and it had its conveniences. It bears the stamp of inevitability, of juristic necessity, and thus relieves the judge from the responsibility of an unpopular decision. It led to strange consequences. A state court invalidated a labor law applicable only to women, on the ground that women had the same " natural rights " as men, and hence could not be made the subject of a law not equally applicable to men. The United States Supreme Court upset a state law limiting to ten the hours of labor in bakeries, on the ground that there was no legal relation between hours of labor and health, although a state commission of experts had found that there was such a connection in fact. This method has now generally been discredited. For it is now realized that the appearance of logical inevitability is only an illusion. It is the warmth generated by human sympathies and aversions that determines the direction the logical process will take, not any cold and abstract deduction. The formal dress in which the decisions were clothed merely concealed the fact that it was a political function which the courts were exercising, and that their social outlook ultimately determined their conclusions. A more realistic point of view appeared. Beginning with the epoch-making brief of Mr. Brandeis in Muller v. Oregon, the conception has gradually prevailed that the relation of a law to health and safety and welfare, to commerce and society, is a question for empirical investigation rather than legal speculation. And gradually, also, Mr. Justice Holmes's view has gained ground—that the legislative power over liberty and property is not to be confined within predetermined legal categories, but that it extends to all the great human wants, and comprises all measures that a " strong and preponderant public opinion " sanctions. The decisions in the Oregon minimum wage and ten hour law cases, now pending, will reveal whether these views now command a majority of the United States Supreme Court.

Yet while this more realistic attitude toward social legislation marks an immense advance over the discredited scholasticism to which Mr. Justice Pitney's dissent harks back, it also brings to light with increasing clarity the utter absurdity of submitting questions of this sort to a judicial tribunal. If the relation of social legislation to health and public welfare is a question of fact, is a court of cloistered jurists, without even a staff of scientific investigators, capable of deciding it? Is not that precisely the function of a legislature, with its committees and experts? And is the Supreme Court more competent to determine whether a law is in consonance with a preponderant public opinion than a legislature, whose very tenure is dependent on public opinion? That the Supreme Court should continue to exercise this function is one of the standing anomalies of our constitutional system.

It has become a commonplace that perhaps the most far-reaching effect of the present war will be an ever-increasing scope of governmental control over private business, and over the standards of life and labor. The United States no more than the countries of Europe can resist it. It is a program which will call for a thorough revision of many prevailing conceptions of property and private liberty; but it promises immense gains in national efficiency and happiness. This whole program is imperiled as long as the Supreme Court retains its present power over social legislation; how ominous the peril is, the five to four decisions of the past few weeks reveal. There are only two ways of avoiding it. Either the appointments to the Supreme Court must be frankly based on the political and social outlook of the nominee; or the Supreme Court must be shorn of its present power of upsetting social legislation on the ground that it is inconsistent with due process. Can it be doubted that the latter is the safer and sounder course?

The New
REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1917, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT, ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER.

EDITORS
HERBERT CROLY WALTER LIPPMANN
PHILIP LITTELL FRANCIS HACKETT
ALVIN S. JOHNSON
GEORGE SOULE—Assistant Editor

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FOUR DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES TEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FOUR DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, FIVE DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE.

REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER. ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

America Prepares

IT seems that we are about to strike Germany; and I propose to report the bones and muscles and nerves of the organization, naval and financial and military and proletarian and industrial and scientific, with which we shall strike her.

It is an organization which has become suddenly appallingly profound. We used to be reproached, as a nation, with a lack of long-view thoroughness. To-day, in a sense, we might be reproached with an excess of it.

To begin at the very bottom and at the very back, where research, the mother of national safety as of national prosperity, holds sway, we have—besides the Naval Consulting Board which is now locating a national laboratory under an appropriation of $1,500,000 for the devising and improving of gyroscopes and submarine-detectors and other objects of naval utility—and besides Mr. Hollis Godfrey, member of the Advisory Commission of the Council of National Defense, president of Drexel Institute in Philadelphia, author of The Man Who Ended War, who, on behalf of the Council of National Defense, is charged supremely with organizing our facilities for investigation and experimentation for war purposes—and besides the Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, an officially constituted body, which secures and publishes fundamental inquiries on The Behavior of Aeroplanes in Gusts by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and on Aviation Wires and Cables, Their Fastenings and Connections, by John A. Roebling's Sons Company—and besides numerous other committees, commissions and boards for researching and for coördinating the researches and then for coördinating the coördinators—finally, beneath the bottom and behind the back, complete, we have the National Research Council, called into being by President Wilson himself out of the National Academy of Sciences and now resident at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington and at the Engineering Foundation on Thirty-ninth Street in New York, with ten committees, all-embracive, starting with a Military Committee and running to a Committee on Zoölogy and Animal Morphology. I doubt if any other nation ever responded to the prospect of war with a scheme of national defense which included a Committee on Zoölogy and Animal Morphology. And there is also a Committee on Nitrate Supply.

Whoever will look at our interest in nitrates will admit our thoroughness gladly. We must have explosives. We must have the raw materials of explosives. We must have nitrates. We must have a vast reserve stock of nitrates. Some navy might cut us off from the world's supply of natural nitrates in Chile. Mr. Daniels sends a naval collier to Antofagasta in Chile and buys 5,000,000 pounds of natural nitrates and brings them home and stores them against the day of need. Congress appropriates for many more million pounds of natural nitrates and for their storage. Congress also appropriates for a $20,000,000 plant in the United States to manufacture artificial nitrates with nitrogen from the air—a project looking admirably toward a long-view distant security. It will be completed in years to come and will serve us in wars yet unforeseen. I go to the War Department to ask the Secretary of War a question. The day is March 14th. War with Germany, if not existent, is imminent. Washington vibrates with it. I learn, with a great astonishment and, I must admit, with a certain awe, that the Secretary of War is touring the South looking for a river with a water-fall and a water-power suitable to be the site of our prospective nitrates-industry. The Secretary of Agriculture is looking with him. So is the Secretary of the Interior. All three are members of the Council of National Defense. The Council of National Defense has six members. Half of the Council of National Defense, on the slippery slope of an instant war, are scheduled to spend a week in the South and then two weeks in the West locating an industry to be an integral philosophical part of our ultimate Perfect Preparedness. Could coolness and thoroughness go further?

They return from the South, having studied the rivers Broad, Saluda, Congaree, Savannah, Wateree, Chattahoochee, Tallapoosa, Coosa and Etowah; and I ask the Secretary of War my question. The Secretary of War is a highly intelligent and highly industrious person. No intelligence, no industriousness, however, can cope with the task of doing the whole future preparedness of the United States at once. There will be gaps. My question has to do with the call for recruits. England allowed miners and smelters and machinists and other useful persons to get into the trenches; went after them and fished them out and dragged them home; and established her List of Certified Occupations, intricately classifying her skilled workers, or her national industrial safety, by trade and by age and by marital condition. In the November 20th, 1916, issue of this List a man who is a foreman in a wool-combing establishment must not be taken by the recruiting authorities at any age if he

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is a married man and, if he is a single man, must not be taken unless he is under thirty. That is the estimate of the balance between the trench-value and the home-value of wool-combing foremen. The call for recruits is step one in the war on land. For national industrial safety there must be classifications in that call. What law have we, establishing classifications or empowering the administration to establish them? The Secretary of War tells me that we have no such law. He tells me further that, so far as he is aware, no such law has been drafted.

It is true that the general National Defense act of June 3rd, 1916, after providing that the "militia" shall consist of all able-bodied males who are more than 18 and not more than 45, goes on to make certain exemptions. It exempts pilots and mariners; it exempts artificers and workmen in armories and arsenals and navy yards of the federal government; it exempts customs-house clerks and persons engaged in the transmission of the mails; it exempts the executive and judicial officers of the federal government and of state governments; it exempts conscientious objectors; and it specifically exempts the Vice President of the United States. Here, if it should be used in a call for recruits, we have the germ of a List of Certified Occupations. But it is only a germ. It is so clearly only a germ that the Secretary of War did not even mention it. To develop it into an effective working List will be a long labor. At the moment we have no legislation —and the Secretary of War is aware of no definite proposed legislation—under which we can be sure that "indispensables" will be turned back from the recruiting stations by known classes of trade and age and marital condition and will not be permitted to flow into the ranks from unchecked and unsuspected sources by hundreds of thousands to the actual exclusion of real "eligibles."

Nitrates and recruits are a parable. They are a physical expression of our national mental state. We made up our minds some time ago that war could be. We did not make up our minds that war could be tomorrow morning. Still less did we make up our minds that war could be tomorrow morning against a known specific enemy. In fact, one might almost say that we have not been thinking of war as *action* at all. We have been thinking of a concave imaginary thing called *defense*.

The President told the Naval Consulting Board in so many words that the Navy should be prepared "not for war but for defense." The Navy has done many admirable things for defense. It has even found time to allocate a couple of dozen whaleboats and cutters with masts and centerboards and (in some cases) gasoline engines to the Boy Scouts of Philadelphia who thus in time will grow up into a race of sea-dogs. It has also built excellent battleships and designed magnificent battle-cruisers. Yet, ever since the day when the Lusitania was sunk, our one known specific prospective enemy has been Germany and its submarine. Against this enemy, as against every other enemy, now and always, the only "defense" is an "offensive." Against the submarine the only regular naval boat capable of a genuine "offensive" is the destroyer. Destroyers can be done in eighteen months. Our destroyer the Wadsworth, for instance, had her keel laid on February 23rd, 1914, and was in commission on July 23rd, 1915. Since the Lusitania was sunk we have had almost two years. In that time we have received fourteen new destroyers into our fleet. But in that time we have also received four new battleships. Naval men have usually demanded four destroyers for every one battleship to serve it, to screen it, to operate in conjunction with it. If our four new battleships went to Cuba or to Mexico they would need all fourteen new destroyers and two more. We have accumulated no excess of destroyers. On the stocks to-day we have only five destroyers building—the Shaw, Caldwell, Stockton, Conner and Manley—that can be finished this year. The navy has been following, properly, the principle laid down for it by the people and the people's political leaders. It has been building an ideal fleet to defend the United States against an ideal foe. Against our present foe—against the foe who for almost two years has been our one clearly indicated foe—we cannot use our battle-cruisers; because, among other reasons, there never has been a chance that we could get them ready in time; and we do not need any artificial nitrates industry at all; because, among other reasons, when Germany cannot cut off Liverpool from Antofagasta she most certainly cannot cut off San Francisco. What we could to-day use and what we do to-day need is a scientific selection of recruits and a horde of anti-submarine boats. One is the first thing on land, and the other is the first thing on sea. Our curious state of preparedness, induced by our curious state of mind, is that we actually are well on our way toward many magnificent ultimate things when simultaneously many manifest immediate things remain undone or even unplanned.

The bad in this situation will produce scandals enough. The good should surely be recognized and supported in fairness and steadfast loyalty. I propose, in articles ensuing, to report first the thing that seems most overwhelmingly immediate —ships—warships to destroy submarines—cargo-ships to frustrate submarines—ships to restore us to the world and to the world's future. The building and the manning of them will require all that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we have of organization. The last two years, in partial compensation for having been devoted so largely to things ultimate, have given us a great deal of ultimate fundamental organization.

In this respect, in truth, the last two years have responded to our present national temperament. Mr. Kipling's American who turned "a keen untroubled face home to the instant need of things" has been succeeded by an American who inclines to refuse to do so much as turn his hand in a new job until he has adorned his office-wall with a chart showing raw materials, entrance of raw materials, working-force, delegation and distribution of authority through working-force, finished products and routes of delivery in black, red, green and purple squares, circles and connecting lines.

In the last two years we have made the rough sketch of many squares, circles and connecting lines for a United States strong within to be strong without. When we see a new Munitions Standards Board at Washington, we may think we see only mere clutter. It is not clutter at all. Among the seven members of the Advisory Commission of the Council of National Defense is Mr. Howard E. Coffin of the Hudson Motor Car Company who played a leading rôle in standardizing motor-car parts for the whole American motor-car industry. The Munitions Standards Board is in a circle in Mr. Coffin's square of the Advisory Commission. He is the engineering link in this matter between the engineers of America and the American government. The business link is the Director of the Commission—a permanent paid official, Mr. Walter S. Gifford—who used to be statistician in charge of the whole statistical department of the American Telegraph and Telephone Company—a young business man of the most modern American scientific organizing type. Through Mr. Gifford and Mr. Coffin the work and the will of the Munitions Standards Board can proceed readily and directly to the six members of the Cabinet who constitute the Council of National Defense and, with their approval, can go fast and straight toward becoming an effective national policy of the American government in all its departments and enterprises.

The Council of National Defense is the center-piece in our national chart; and it is a most competently designed center-piece; and it is already stretching out connecting lines toward many other pieces recently flung upon that chart by public and by private act. How will these new pieces fit into the old pieces and how will all of them, new and old, fit together into the sudden immense task of making our new anti-submarine fighting commerce-carrying fleet? Where will the Council itself come in? Where the Federal Shipping Board? Where the designers and constructors in the Navy Department—men like Admiral Taylor—inferior to none in the world? Where our new Naval Reserve? Where our new Fleet Naval Reserve? Where our new Naval Auxiliary Reserve? Where our new Naval Coast Defense Reserve? Where our new Volunteer Naval Reserve? Where Mr. Samuel Gompers, who reigns in the square of Labor in the Advisory Commission of the Council of National Defense and who may soon have it upon him to see that great new masses of men are drawn from their present places into shipyards on all sections of our coasts and there organized to labor without oppressions and without strikes?

In ships our present accomplishment and our organization for future accomplishments will take their most practical instant test and tell their most redeeming story. WILLIAM HARD.

Dimension in Language

IT was a painter who first made me see that written language is not so much a perfect instrument seldom mastered as a necessarily cramping and ungenerous medium. In trying to put in words a bit of his mind he had difficulty with his clauses. They would string out interminably, until it was impossible to say what the prepositions referred to, or to arrive at the subtle distinctions in coördination and dependence which he wanted to express. He had the constant feeling, he said, that his thought had to be crushed and diluted so it could flow along a thin pipe, instead of being filled out in its just relations as if on a canvas. Mathematicians and scientists of course discovered this long ago, and turned to diagrams and equations. But how satisfactory it would be if not only the stiff logic of the mind, but the intangible equations and harmonies which give ideas their space and color could be arranged as in a painting, so that we could follow their suggestions back and forth, slowly come to the understanding of the design as nucleus after nucleus grew to its completion in our sight, and finally rest in balance among the justly related elements. Not long ago I saw the blotched and interlined manuscript of a philosopher, and understood how, in the fiercest endeavor to include all his thought in the words, he had strained and weighted sentences beyond any pretence of beauty or even clarity. Ever since then I have wondered how often writers whose style is admired have been seduced by the love of melody to do violence to their souls, whether the choice of one word-color or cadence instead of another really does not more often represent a surrender than an achievement, and whether after all it is true that the style is the man himself—except in the sense

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that handwriting gives clues to chirographic detectives.

There is, of course, the pleasure of the craftsman in doing his best with a refractory medium, and the induced pleasure in watching another's skill acting within the rules of a game. Many have received so keen a joy at this dexterity that they are led to declare the true condition of beauty to be the conflict of effort with limitations, and to derogate any discarding of known limitations for new and more generous ones. Perhaps there are states of mind perfectly expressible in language; but any reader with a love for something beyond cleverness will value a passage not so much for a content small enough to be exactly adjusted to its form as for a content which is felt to have expanded the form, to overflow it, to circle beyond it. This is, for instance, the charm of Henry James's style: he did not take language as it was given him and busy himself with the game of finding meanings which neatly and gracefully would fit into it; he kept stretching it and using it for new purposes until he made of this one-dimensional medium an imitation of three dimensions, something in which recurring variations of suggestion lead outward and back again until it conveys not a simplified procession of ideas, but a rich mind as it exists to itself. Others may disagree, but I feel too that it is no perfection I am thus enjoying; my admiration for the way Mr. James used language is less than my admiration for what was in his mind; the language itself is sometimes clumsy, and I believe if he could have used a better medium he would have been able to express more of what was in his mind, the medium would still have suggested escaping reverberations, and I should have been better pleased.

Such reflections have made me hospitable to any attempt to do things with language that have not before been tried. If writing existed merely as an invitation to virtuosity, or if people had always been able to discover themselves in it fully, there would be reason to repulse any way of writing except the ancient ones. But just as I am willing to admit that Chinese, however uncouth it looks, may offer advantages of expression not in English, so I am willing to look at uncomprehended or unfamiliar combinations of English words to see if, after one had tried to understand them, he might not have discovered a new break in the limitations of language. There must always be other minds and other ways to expand it.

Therefore when a painter (not the painter mentioned at first) Charles Duncan, gave me to read a description of a cubist portrait bust by Constantine Brancusi, I did not laugh at him for its strangeness—for he simply said that he was not trying to be strange, but to say what he felt. As I read it again and again it gave me pleasure, and I believe that it told me much of what he felt.

Constantine Brancusi's Portrait of Mme. P. D. K.

A spiritual and sensitive French woman is represented *being* in joy, quiet conscious in exultant joy. It lifts, bending.

It is given swift—and strong and the eye contains its simpleness.

One tremendous sheer fulness, moving balanced, lifts three round forms, each as big as night.

Rounds grow to a single round, and up: to you and recede: an up lengthening bending cylinder—to turn, a line gracious bending, intact, a triple descending rhythm: complete. The surface, bronze, silk texture—bright bronze, light shot and shadows, near and deep in space—glistening metal surface. The eye circles—in, it thinks; returns out—up and down—you walk around the axised in and out, up and down concerted lifting bending units; forms, surfaces, lines, colors, balanced—a oneness of ecstasy, feminine. Until your aliveness is quickened to this height of expression the eye can retain only the needle swung balance.

The craftsmanship appears strange because it is an effective loving the medium. And the hands identify the craft of the mind. Into one movement burned the simple reality expressed—fused from three parts. Intense sensitive passion and restraint made the proportions move through one another—the finality of direct speech—which is finality and instinct with truth; qualities which leave us defenseless when unconsciously expressed—but here they are conscious and synthesized.

Of course I may be deceiving myself about this, but I think somebody will agree with me that this description conveys something, and conveys it tolerably well. It might even be translated into ordinary language, someone who has read it will say. If you think so, try it as I did, compare the translation with the original, and see if that conveys as much. May it not be true of this, as the author writes of the portrait, that "the craftsmanship appears strange because it is an effective loving the medium"?

GEORGE SOULE.

Growth of Federalism

OBVIOUSLY the growth of federal authority at the expense of the state governments has been one of the steadier tendencies in our politics. The old states' rights theory of sovereignty, and even the more moderate perception of the state as its own administrator, have yielded to an increasing centralization. It has been a process almost without intermission. Even the last Congress, busy as it was in denouncing itself for its own rules, found time to accent a little more convincingly the subordination of the state governments. One of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

measures on which action was had before the filibuster came into full swing was an act making illegal the mailing of intoxicants into prohibition states. Such a restriction was already in force in certain states; but some eight or ten others were, without consultation, provided with a much less plastic brand of prohibition than they had willed for themselves. The act is significant not so much because it controverts a state right as because it is a good illustration of the usual lack of a working compromise. The states go one way, the federal government another. Occasionally there is even active competition. One of the questions taken up in the recent session was a proposal to take the power and duty of railroad regulation from the states and vest it entirely in the hands of the federal government, except in matters so essentially local that they could not be used to interfere with the just rights of the carriers.

The falling off in state power is not due to any apathy on the part of the state legislative bodies—for the most part they have written laws all too willingly; it is due rather to the fact that the new emphasis in lawmaking has placed the states in a false position. So long as their function consisted chiefly in guiding the property rights of a primarily agricultural community they were capable enough. One arbitrary political subdivision was as good as another. But when the industrializing process set in, and a program of social legislation became essential, not only to state but to national welfare, then national machinery was quite naturally resorted to. A federal child labor law is the product of state failure to recognize responsibility. The development of the country along industrial lines has not been accompanied by any direct change in the interests of the state legislatures. They still represent geographical divisions in a day when economic groups are the real centers of local opinion.

The shift in authority from state governments to new local representative institutions is already under way. The system of Rural Credit banks, for instance, raises a regional structure consistent with economic conditions. It has no reverence for state lines; it is concerned with establishing over logically unified areas a sufficient measure of self-government under a central political control. Designed not to compete but to coöperate with its home office, it seems, like the Federal Reserve system, to suggest a fruitful redistribution of privileges and powers. Certainly the tendency at present is in that direction. What local authority and opinion is desirable can exist more substantially under a régime of natural homogeneity.

Nevertheless, there is one instrument for the development of the dual form of government into a workable mechanism whose possibilities are perhaps not fully recognized. That instrument is the active coöperation existing between the federal departments and the state governments. It is an unspectacular labor, and for the most part poorly advertised. In its simplest form it consists of an alliance for economy and efficiency. Thus the Federal Reclamation Service, in taking up an investigation of the Silver Lake project, first entered into an agreement with the state of Oregon whereby the expense of the work was to be shared alike and the data to be accessible to both parties. Here is a successful bridging of the gap in the dual form of government. The Silver Lake project was properly a matter of both state and national concern; it was satisfactorily put in hand because the traditional separation of powers was sensibly ignored. Dual supervision of this sort marks much of the work of the Reclamation Service, and of federal agencies with similar interests. The Geographical Survey has for many years coöperated with the state geologists to avoid duplication and to cover wider areas with the increased funds thus made available. Most of the bureaus in the Department of Agriculture—Soils, Plant Industry, Entomology—would be unable to carry on their work of investigation satisfactorily if the active assistance of the states were withdrawn through a policy of rigid non-interference in matters once thought to be of only local concern. It is natural that scientific interests have overridden most completely an obstructive and artificial separation of powers.

An even more complete welding of interests originally deemed foreign is presented in the coöperation of state and federal powers to further the work of conservation. It would come hard to a founder of the Constitution to behold federal watchmen and state watchmen patrolling the same forest reserve. It would once have been thought an impertinent usurpation for the national government to display interest in the task of keeping the state woodlots from going up in smoke. To-day where conservation in natural resources—and in plant and animal industry—is most successful, it is in those states which have not permitted an obsolete tenet of government to stand in the way of trained federal assistance. Certain states have acknowledged that the central government has even a direct interest in the conservation of human life. The Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor is at present carrying on a campaign for birth registration and infant mortality investigations in coöperation with various state boards of health. The director of the Bureau of Mines, in explaining the twenty per cent decrease in fatalities in the last three years, declares that "What

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has been accomplished so far is due to the friendly coöperative spirit that exists between the state mine inspectors, the operators, the miners and the Bureau of Mines."

In many instances the degree of successful conservation depends upon an efficient enforcement of certain regulative acts. Where such laws have been drawn by both state and national governments, the more vigorous federal agencies carry coöperation to the point of aiding the state authorities in the enforcement of both codes. In states in which national forests are located the Forest Service coöperates with the state governments in enforcing such game and stock laws as are operative. So well recognized is the joint responsibility that many of the forest rangers have been appointed deputy state game wardens. A similar fusion of effort has made possible the enforcement of the federal Food and Drugs act. Without an alliance of both state and federal agencies a uniform administration of the law would have been out of question, and in the absence of some quick method of distributing information it would be possible for a manufacturer to dispose of his adulterated products in another state for some time after detection. Along much the same lines is the work of the federal Horticultural Board in conniving with state agencies to enforce the Plant Quarantine act. The most recent offer of coöperation is the letter sent last month by the Attorney-General and the Secretaries of Labor and Commerce to the forty-eight governors, inviting their participation in a scrupulous enforcement of the new interstate child-labor law.

Such instances as have been cited here reflect a more than perfunctory disposition of the departments to coöperate. While the states have competed with the national government in matters of legislation—or at best been indifferent to it—they have accepted departmental assistance as no affront to the dignity of self-government. It is probable that a more vigorous spirit of confederation has developed through these channels than is realized. It is uncoördinated, and even surreptitious; but it is none the less active, and reinforced by a long period of collusion during which both agencies have come to plan on a definite contribution from the other side. It is interesting that Congress has somewhat gropingly laid hold of this instrument in its most recent attempts at national integration.

A measure which indicates the direction of effort is the Federal Aid Roads act. The Department of Agriculture has long been carrying on investigation work in highway construction and maintenance; the eighty-five million dollar act of Congress vests it with a greatly increased share of a responsibility heretofore regarded as an almost purely state or county matter. It not only encourages but enforces coöperation. To receive the benefits of the act a state must assume half the burden of expense and submit, through its highway department, a definite and comprehensive program of construction over a five-year period. A prize is set upon the admission that state independence in administrative matters is as obsolete where national interests are concerned as state sovereignty.

Though the service of the Department of Agriculture as a medium between state and nation in this work has not yet been tested, it has satisfactorily been tried out in the field of education. The Smith-Lever act, an extension of the earlier Morrill act, made a similar proposal of conditional coöperation to the states. It offered aid to the agricultural institutions provided the state furnished an amount equal to the national appropriation. Since the passage of the act in May, 1914, the offer has been accepted in each instance. A single agricultural college in each state has been designated as the beneficiary, and the danger of too thinly spread appropriations thereby evaded. That good judgment should be so universally displayed, as well as a willingness to accept federal aid in a function traditionally a state prerogative, seems remarkable. There has been some friction in the early application of the act, but none growing out of the principle, and the Smith-Lever act has been followed by three measures even less considerate of any state pretensions. The so-called Warehouse act places it within the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to issue licenses applicable to warehouses owned, operated or leased by any state, while the Grain Standards act seems to disregard even more openly the traditional respect for dual authority. It provides that in any state possessing a grain inspection department, "the Secretary of Agriculture shall issue licenses to the persons duly authorized and employed to inspect and grade grain under the laws of such state." Certainly such an avowal is remote from the erstwhile principles of the political party which sponsored it. Finally, there is the Cotton Futures act, placing in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture an instrument designed to curb the evils of speculation and revive unfettered competition in the marketing of a great crop.

On the whole it is probably true that none of this legislation will weigh as heavily in the end as organic laws such as the Federal Reserve act and the Rural Credits act. It seems clear that new organs, consciously designed to express an economic provincialism, are the logical sequence to such artificial and arbitrary divisions as the states. But it also seems clear that if anything is to raise

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

up the states from the position of obstructive uselessness into which they are sinking it will be a higher development of coöperation through the departments. That coöperation has great need of advertisement. It has grown timorously, and as if in spite of public indifference. Even so, it has become the spirit of those departments which deal directly with domestic affairs. It has saved much waste of duplication and offered a means for creative research that would not otherwise have been possible. Caught between the chequered state legislatures and a national body intent upon patronage, it may yet be snuffed out. But it holds a promise, and invites closer inspection than it has received.

CHARLES MERZ.

German Tariff Plans

THIS pamphlet,* or rather booklet, was prepared for the Verein für Sozialpolitik, the well known association of German economists, and was read at its meeting of 1915. The preface of the reprint which lies before us is dated August, 1915. The author is professor of political science at Bonn, and is well known among German authors on his subject. He has written at large upon the tariff relations between Germany and other countries. He is supposed to be in close touch with his government, and was sent by that government, before the war, to serve as exchange professor in this country, at Columbia University. It would seem justified to consider his utterances representative.

Schumacher begins by recalling that Germany and France were brought into peculiar relations by the Frankfurt treaty of 1871, which terminated the Franco-German war. In that treaty each country granted to the other, once for all, treatment on the basis of the most favored nation. Whatever relaxations of duty or commercial privileges Germany granted in favor of any country, inured *ipso facto* to France; and similarly as regards France's favors. This liberal arrangement, natural enough under the conditions of 1871, when the trend throughout Europe was toward lower duties and greater freedom of trade, became increasingly unwelcome with the growth of protection and the accentuation in every direction of hostile feelings between the two countries. Both tried to evade it and nullify it, not only by maximum and minimum tariff arrangements, but also by administrative tricks and covert discriminations, which led to unending friction and numberless angry protests. The great war has now terminated all treaties; each country is free to proceed untrammeled in the development of its tariff policy; and Schumacher's paper is concerned with the new problems.

His main contention, as indicated by the title, is that *Meistbegünstigung* (most favored nation treatment) is to be thrown overboard. In its place there should be tariff discrimination (*Zollunterscheidung*). Germany's tariff is to be reconstructed with extreme and even meticulous care, with an eye to bargaining adroitly with other countries, and attaining both the maximum of concession from foreigners for German goods and the minimum of concession from Germany for foreign goods. There should be something like a tripartite system, similar to that of Canada: three scales of duties, one for friends, another for neutrals, a third for enemies. Further, the tariff rates are to be classified more minutely than before and statistics of importation are to be kept in greater detail. The object should be to ascertain just what grades and classes of goods are likely to be imported into Germany; these are still to be kept out by effectively restrictive duties; while, on the other hand, the goods not likely to be imported in fact, and these only, are to be admitted under low treaty rates. In other words, the tariff system is to be so manipulated as to render concessions nominal and illusory. One recalls Adam Smith's delightful phrase about tariff bargaining: it is matter for "the skill of that insidious and crafty animal, vulgarly called a statesman or politician."

It need not be further explained that Schumacher's general attitude is that of "neo-mercantilism": a euphemism for frank and unflinching protectionism. The stress is all upon markets, selling, getting rid of your goods, circumventing the foreigner. Buy, but do not sell; cheat, but do not get cheated. The advantage of foreign trade is to be tested according to the "buying capacity" or "absorbing capacity" of the country with which you deal. That any advantage can possibly accrue through securing goods to advantage *from* the foreign country is never for a moment intimated, and evidently never contemplated. That there is such a thing as a division of labor between nations, and an exchange advantageous to both parties, never seems to enter the man's mind. Buying from abroad is always bad business. He

* Meistbegünstigung und Zollunterscheidung: Betrachtungen über eine Neugestaltung der deutschen Handelspolitik nach dem Kriege. Von Hermann Schumacher. Munich und Leipsic, 1915.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

finds it even regrettable that Germany procures from foreign countries any of her raw materials. She is to produce within her own borders everything that is physically possible. Wheat after all is luxurious diet; better not import it; home-grown rye should be substituted! Barley is to be grown for cattle feed, replacing imported cotton-seed cake and the like. Flax is to take the place of cotton. International trade is treated as if it were precisely like an individual's affairs: you prosper only by your selling, and stand to lose by your buying.

The state of mind is sadly familiar. Complete as has been the refutation of these fallacies by every intelligent writer on economics since the days of Adam Smith, the mercantilist attitude holds its own with unshaken tenacity with the man on the street and even with the man who sits in the editorial chair of the ordinary financial newspaper. The surprising thing is its recrudescence among the professional economists of the Continent during the last thirty years. The Germans are by no means alone in this woful reaction. It is no less to be seen among the French and the Austrians. It is connected beyond doubt with nationalism, national rivalries, and national hatreds. It is a cause of hostile feeling and also a consequence of that feeling. It foments war and is fomented by war.

Schumacher, however, goes far beyond the general proposals just mentioned. He considers with much detail the treaty policy which Germany should adopt after the war—after a war crowned with victory. It is significant of the rigor of his mercantilist views that, notwithstanding the widespread prepossessions among his countrymen in favor of closer trade relations with Austria and the Near East, he expects comparatively little from expansion in these directions. A customs union between Germany and Austria will profit the former but little. Austria, we are told, is already saturated with German goods; she buys as much as Germany can in any case hope to sell her. The Balkan countries and the Levant also offer comparatively little. Their "buying power" or "absorbing power" is after all slight, and in them also Germany can find no considerable opportunity for marketing her wares. Exports must be pushed elsewhere, in the regions of large population and large buying power. Two of these lie near at hand, France and Russia; and a victorious war should result in enlarging German markets in them.

The means proposed are startling. A treaty of peace with France is contemplated which shall provide for the permanent retention by Germany of conquered territory, but shall also provide for special tariff relations as regards this conquered French territory. The industries of the conquered region might be dangerous to German industries—might prove troublesome competitors. Therefore it is to be stipulated that for a considerable period (ten years, say), goods produced in this German-owned French territory shall be admitted into France under favored tariff rates. On the other hand, such goods are *not* to be admitted freely into Germany. That is, these regions, although conquered and incorporated into German territory, are not to be allowed to menace the industries of Germany; their baleful competition is still to be directed to the remaining parts of France. It is a most curiously consistent manifestation of the mercantilist attitude. An undergraduate of respectable intelligence, conversant with the elements of economics — the modern counterpart of Macaulay's schoolboy—would say at once that the economic advantage to Germany from conquered territory was derived through free trade with that territory, and through its ability to supply goods cheaply and advantageously to Germany. And similarly, a provision by which the goods of the conquered territory should move freely into France is obviously one through which France would retain the economic gain, although losing political control. But no! From the thick-and-thin protectionist point of view goods that come in freely are always a menace; it is the sale of goods for money that is the one desirable and certain source of national gain.

Even more startling are the proposals with regard to the general tariff system which is to be imposed on France. She is to stipulate that goods imported by land shall be admitted at lower duties than goods imported by sea. This is to take the form of regulations—not directed on their face against one country or another. The treaty is not to impose overt tariff discrimination in favor of Germany—no such violation of international decency and comity. But the general stipulation for lower duties on imports by land obviously will work, in fact, to the advantage of Germany, since she sends in her goods by rail, and to the disadvantage of England and the United States, which send in theirs by water. And this, its avowed object, is attained with entire propriety through the device proposed! Germany is thus to secure, as a result of the war, larger markets in France, at the expense particularly of England. The stipulation, however, is to be applied not to all goods, but only to certain selected articles, the export of which from Germany to France it will serve more particularly to stimulate. French goods, on the other hand, are not to have favored rates in Germany, and are not even to be treated necessarily on

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the most-favored nation basis; Germany's hands are to be quite free. It is the same old story. Cram your goods down the foreigner's throat, if necessary by force; make him disgorge his money; but always watch your own purchases, and let him have none of *your* money.

As regards Russia, however, this régime is not to be applied. German exports are as likely to go to Russia by water as by rail; therefore a different sort of favoring treatment is to be secured from that country. To this end there should be a minute specialization in tariff rates. Arrange craftily to get German goods into the great Russian market, and control it against other countries.

All this is frankly explained to be a "cool-headed policy of might" (Nüchterne Machtpolitik). Let there be no sentimentalism. "War creates an exceptional situation in commercial politics (Handelspolitik) as well as in other matters. . . . The victor on the bloody battlefield is in quite a different position from the commercial bargainer in time of peace." In fact, tariff favors and gains are to take the place of war indemnities. As regards Great Britain it is regretfully admitted to be "doubtful whether we can compel England to pay a considerable war indemnity." Let her pay in trade losses. Russia in any case has not the means to pay an indemnity. But Russia can be made to pay in land, of which she has plenty; and she must also be made a rich "absorbing" market for German products. There is no specific mention of an indemnity from France; it does not appear whether in 1915 our author still contemplated something of the sort. But, regardless of possible indemnities, the subjection of France to the German market is something which the victor can insist upon.

How representative are these extraordinary proposals? The stupid policy of Great Britain in completely cutting off all German exports of books as well as of other things has prevented access to complete reports of the proceedings of the Verein für Sozialpolitik, and of the debates on this paper, which happen to have come to our hands through other channels than the mail. Perhaps it represents a state of mind which the author himself adverts to when speaking of some jingo tariff proposals of British extremists—"ephemeral monstrous exaggeration engendered by war." But alas, it is hardly to be adjudged exceptional or solitary, or even ephemeral. It is in accord with the whole trend of German political and economic opinion during the last ten or twenty years. It is part of Machtpolitik and Weltwirtschaft. It is but another indication of what a portentous thing would be a victorious Germany.

At the Capitol

IF the last Congress did nothing to make itself useful to the country in a crisis, its two years' experience at least familiarized it with emergencies. There may be some profit, accordingly, in the fact that the Congress which meets on Monday is more nearly identical with its predecessor than has been the case in recent times. Whatever impression was made by public resentment at the shortcomings of the last session will be carried substantially into the new Congress; for all but sixteen of the old Senate will return, and the House will contain fewer new members than any House since that elected in 1909, and fewer proportionally than any during the last twenty years.

The similarity of the old and the new Senate will be more pronounced as a result of the Congressional custom of confusing seniority with the fitness to bear responsibility. Few of the members who drop out have served long enough to attain any considerable authority. Of the sixteen only five had completed more than a single term, and to the present situation those five are not indispensable: Clark and Clapp, neither of whom has played a direct part in foreign affairs; Oliver and Sutherland, who were on the Committee, but with limited influence; and duPont, whose consistent absence on four votes in every six indicates that for some time his interests have been largely extramural. Of the seventy-five committee chairmanships only twelve will change hands, and these are chiefly of the minor sort: Mr. O'Gorman's retirement, for instance, means a new head for the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, and the defection of Mr. Martine leaves vacant the chair in the Committee on Disposition of Useless Papers. The more essential chairmanships were not affected by the elections in November—Foreign Relations, Military Affairs, Appropriations, Interstate Commerce, Naval Affairs. In fact, it is a tribute to the seniority custom that not only the chairmanships but the higher ranking positions on both sides were largely kept intact.

It is apparent that in the Senate which will serve through this critical period there will be little which has not already been well weighed. Only a few personalities, such as Hiram Johnson and Philander Knox, will mark it faintly as a new body. Even so, it is likely to seem more changed than the House, where the much larger membership demands the complete relegation of all new members to some such obscurity as a post on the Committee of the Census or the Committee on Revolutionary Claims. In the House it requires at least three terms for a representative, no matter how consistently he neglects public interests, to secure any sort of committee influence. But once established in a station from which he may deal out patronage his position is almost assured. There were in the last House 148 members who had served more than three terms, and all but twenty-eight—some of whom retired voluntarily—were reëlected. It can be seen, consequently, how little different the important committees in the new House will be. Should the Republicans control the organization, the chairmanships will of course change hands—but scarcely to bring fresh services to the front. The new chairmen in that case will largely be members who were veterans of some standing when Mr. McKinley was President. Not even in the aggregate will the new House seem different; of the 435 members only 85 will be serving for the first time.

Being so nearly identical in makeup with its predecessor, it seems probable that the Congress which convenes next week will not have a greatly different attitude to-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ward the international situation. It is never possible, however, to forecast what Congress will think or do. With almost no debate the Senate on March 8th adopted a cloture rule against which it had held out for twenty years. At the same time it is possible to realize in a general way the background out of which the new Congress will advance to a handling of the present situation. In the last House there were two roll-calls which seemed fair tests of an attitude toward foreign affairs. One was on the tabling of the McLemore resolution, warning American citizens not to take passage on merchant ships of belligerent nations; the other was the Cooper resolution, at the very end of the session, to forbid the arming of American vessels carrying munitions to the Allies. The new House—though it may be stirred to unanimity by the President or by public opinion—will contain 152 members who have voted in support of either the McLemore resolution or the Cooper motion in a previous session. It is not possible to gauge in the same way what might be called the more or less determined anti-war sentiment that will exist in the new Senate. The Gore resolution, which was the running-mate of the McLemore bill, became so intricately amended that a vote on it meant nothing, and the ship arming discussion did not get far enough for any sort of a vote. Three of those who have been charged with filibustering—Works, Clapp and O'Gorman—are retiring; but the other nine hold over, as do at least thirty others whose debate in supporting the ship arming bill disclosed an incredibly vague and often contradictory understanding of the issues they will now be called upon to meet.

One further element which has been thought a possible influence in the present situation is the uncertainty of control in the new House. It has been pointed out that in 1859, during a struggle over the speakership, the lack of any organization prevented the House from receiving President Buchanan's message until eight weeks after it had assembled. No doubt this constitutes one of the precedents so cherished in the congressional system. But whatever the event of Buchanan's day, it is not possible to suppose that it will be repeated now. Party patronage has an appeal, but it is not so forceful as the desire to remain in the good graces of the public. An aroused resentment which effected cloture overnight will scarcely tolerate a postponement of the President's message so that the House may hesitate for days between Champ Clark and James R. Mann, and haggle at length over the question whether Democrat or Republican appointees are to distribute the documents and run the Capitol elevators for the next two years. It is likely that the House will receive the President's message as soon as he desires to deliver it, and that it will organize as soon as it is conscious of public attention. A speedy organization would make logical the ignoring of any suggestions to reform the rules which might be put forward by the independent balance-of-power group. The "coalition" control of which there has been much talk may take the form of divided committee rule, or it may be only an intensified type of the excellent coöperation between parties which has always existed in the handling of any legislation except that in which the public as a whole was directly interested.

Not only must the organization be effected, but a certain amount of routine business must be disposed of before Congress will be prepared for any substantial action. Four of the large appropriation bills, aggregating nearly half a billion dollars, are left over in testimony to the success of the Senate filibuster. Though each of them had passed the last House, with all the relevant and irrelevant discussion that that means, they will now have to be taken back and introduced for the first time. In addition, there are certain measures neglected in the last session which have been made even more essential by the events since Congress adjourned. Such measures are the bill giving the President power to nationalize the railroads in time of war and the Shipping Board amendments for the taking over of foreign vessels building in American yards. These matters are of the sort to encourage protracted and random discussion. It will require a decisiveness to dispose of them promptly that has not been characteristic of recent legislatures; but some treatment of them is almost prerequisite. Practically the same Congress which lately ignored them is now faced with their immediate dispatch. In some astonishment that Congress has felt the force of an irritated public opinion. If it has been impressed by the experience it will proceed sharply to clear for the action demanded of it.

C. M.

Socialists Enunciate New Principles

[NOTE: We gladly publish the following statement from a group of prominent American Socialists.—THE EDITORS.]

DEMOCRATIC DEFENSE:
A Practical Program for Socialism.

THE following ideas are submitted by a group of American Socialists who have the welfare of the movement at heart. We have watched with anxiety the world events of the last two years and a half, and their reaction upon our movement. We have learned much in this period, which has been one of the most momentous in human history. We consider it the business of Socialists to adjust themselves to events. To stand immovably by one's opinions may be a sign of heroism, but it may also be a sign of slothfulness, and it is necessary to discriminate between the two.

First: We declare it our conviction that there is a difference, even from the point of view of revolutionary Socialism, between democratic and autocratic governments. To refuse to recognize the difference is to be an idealist in the bad sense of the word—to take formulas and abstract ideas in place of realities. We believe that liberal institutions have their value, as making it possible to agitate for Socialism and to progress toward Socialism without destructive internal conflict. Socialists have proven this attitude in Europe by combining with bourgeois parties in order to obtain democratic reforms. As a political party, relying upon the vote, we necessarily believe in, support, and defend constitutional government; leaving it to Anarchists and anti-parliamentarian Syndicalists to proclaim the unreality of any distinction among capitalist governmental systems.

Second: We declare it impossible for democratic nations to disarm, or even to weaken their defenses, in the presence of autocratic nations. If we could have the full revolutionary Socialist program in America to-morrow, we might be called upon to defend it against nations which were organized for aggression under military and aristocratic rulers; precisely as revolutionary France was called upon to defend her ideals against the rest of Europe. It is futile to talk of appealing to the workers in countries where the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

workers are unorganized and without power, and would not even be permitted to know of our appeal.

Third: We declare that the proper aim of Socialist world-politics at the present time is an alliance of the politically advanced nations for the defense of the democratic principle throughout the world. If, at the conclusion of the present war, any of the autocratic nations should become democratic, they would, of course, be welcomed into such an alliance. Thus only can progress toward world peace be secured, and gradual disarmament made practicable.

Fourth: As a means to the working out of this program, we declare for the democratization of diplomacy. We would have the world-policies of America precisely declared. We would provide that diplomatic communications should be published, and a more immediate control of foreign relations insisted upon by the people.

Fifth: Pending the securing of world peace by an alliance of democratic nations, it is necessary that the United States should maintain an army and navy. We Socialists are not sentimental or religious non-resistants. We are willing to fight for democracy, and we prove it by the instant sympathy we give to people who are fighting for democracy whether in Petrograd or Colorado. To refuse under any circumstances to vote for military supplies, as has been required by a recent party decree, is to be sentimental rather than scientific, Tolstoyan rather than Marxian.

Sixth: If we must have an army and navy, the question becomes, what kind of army and navy shall we have? We declare that the proper program for the American Socialist movement is the common ownership and democratic control of the instruments and means of defense. We believe that there is no danger to democracy in a citizen army and navy, controlled by the people. The danger lies in an incompetent army and navy, controlled by grafting politicians and a munitions lobby; a hired army of wage-slaves, officered by a class, and serving as a support to the aristocratic tradition.

Seventh: The true Socialist formula is: No private profit from military supplies. In times of emergency, of course, munitions must be bought wherever they can be found. But under ordinary conditions Socialists should favor the nationalization of munitions manufacture. One of the principal menaces of militarism lies in the lobby.

Eighth: We declare for the democratization of the military service. We would democratize West Point and Annapolis by providing that admission to government military and naval schools should be through the ranks, as a reward for physical, mental and moral efficiency demonstrated in the service. We would have social equality the ideal in both army and navy; there is no reason why that spirit of comradeship which is found in the trenches should not be practicable in the training-camp.

Ninth: We declare for the modernization of the military service. Military training is not of necessity futile—it is only stupidity and traditionalism which make it so. The ability to march in a series of perfectly straight lines, which is an important end of the present West Point system, has nothing whatever to do with efficiency in modern warfare. The first essential is that the man should be a part of an organized body, feeling and acting as an organism; that he should be physically fit, able to march long distances and to stand the rigors of outdoor life; and that he should understand the use, not merely of weapons, but of all kinds of machinery. Training to these ends can be obtained in the forestry service, in railroad work, in the harvest fields, in the police and fire departments, in emergency work in floods, storms and accidents; it can be obtained in football, polo and other organized games, in gymnastic work, manual training and camp-life. Our military training should be made the physical culture part of our public school education. It should be begun in childhood, through the work of the Boy and Girl Scouts; it should be continued through youth, when hunting, boating and outdoor activities are the greatest joys of life. Such training could be made so interesting that it would be regarded by everyone as a privilege rather than a duty.

Tenth: We declare that service in such a modern, democratic defense force should be part of the discipline and duty of every citizen, both male and female. To use only volunteers in national defense is to kill off the men of courage and character, and to breed from weakness and incompetence; and this is national suicide. A vital military system should be an organic part of our national life; and as Socialism and democracy bring us towards the World Federation, and put war farther into the background of human possibilities, our military organization would naturally be turned to the ends of peace. The Socialist movement would know how to employ such a disciplined army—in the reconstruction work of industry, the tearing down of slums and the building of the coöperative Commonwealth.

W. J. Ghent
Charmian London
Charles Edward Russell
Mary Craig Sinclair
Upton Sinclair
George Sterling
J. G. Phelps Stokes
William English Walling.

(Walling signs with the reservation of paragraph ten, which he would favor only in case a large land army were needed. Mrs. London states: "Jack London would have signed it, I know.")

CORRESPONDENCE

Believes Neutrality Necessary

SIR: There is a possibility that you are wrong. Continental Americans, at any rate, do not agree with you. They find it impossible to believe that the United States can battle more effectively for the great principles of the new foreign policy, as promulgated in the President's address to the Senate, by coöperating with the Allies and making war upon Germany than by remaining aloof and technically neutral. They believe that the United States has nothing to lose and everything to gain by preserving its neutrality, and nothing to gain and everything to lose by entering the war. They do not share your confidence in the altruistic spirit of the men who control the British navy nor your belief that liberalism is a monopoly of the western Powers. They are inclined to the opinion that Russia, China and the United States have shown more or less recently symptoms of liberalism which are encouraging symbols of a common purpose. They look with dread upon the fulfilment of Dr. Heckscher's declaration to the Reichstag that the attitude of the United States will lay the basis of a new grouping of the Powers, with the Central Empires, Russia and Japan ranged against England and America. Friedrich Naumann's prophecy of two vast economic units, two world alliances,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at peace within and at war without, as the probable outcome of the great war, must not be allowed to come true. Such a balance of power would be a nightmare to civilization and render life on the planet intolerable. What can prevent it? The United States and the neutrals, supported by liberal opinion in England, Germany and Russia. English liberalism may prove to be an illusory and negligible quantity. What with conscription, protective tariff for India, and suspension of jury trial in Ireland we have little assurance that England will ever succeed in re-liberalizing herself. American liberalism will certainly prove to be illusory and negligible if we ever get into war. It is already so feeble that it has to filibuster to make itself heard on an issue of surrendering the war-making powers to the President!

It is more than ever imperative, as the war draws to an end, that the United States should remain technically, however aggressively, neutral. As such we are in the position of a third party, insistently demanding social and international reform, persistently refusing to ally ourselves with either of the old political groups because to do so would be to confuse our purposes and to confound the issue. Our quarrel is not with Germany; our quarrel is with war. We shall never defeat war by defeating Germany. The Quadruple Entente is a double entendre; it covers a world of sins. As a neutral and as the head of the neutrals we can act and we must act to prevent the repetition of this vast catastrophe by swinging the world away from dualism into a coöperative international organization for the defense of civilization. The United States is to-day defending not technical and antiquated laws of the sea but the fundamental human right of neutrality. Our neutrality is no more hypocritical than it was in 1792. It is no more difficult to maintain than it was then; there is even greater duty to maintain it. We are not only defending the right of a state to refrain from participating in a general war, but in so doing we are preserving the very basis of international law. As there can be no civil law without invoking the judgment of a "reasonable man," so there can be no international law without invoking the judgment of a neutral. Are there, then, to be no neutrals in the future? Is there, then, to be no saint in Israel? There will be future wars and there must be future neutrals, or the game of civilization is up. Having taken a brave stand against murder on the high seas, we should take an equally brave stand against robbery of our mails in British ports. We should decide and declare what is to be recognized under modern conditions as contraband of war. (The declaration of a belligerent in this matter has no legal significance and can have none.) Having decided this moot question with impartial judgment, it seems to me that it is our plain duty to see that American ships carry none of it, and that those ships, thus guaranteed by the government, and carrying the United States mail, shall go through to their destinations unsearched and unharmed—German submarines and British cruisers to the contrary notwithstanding. Here is a principle worth fighting for. It is the maintenance of neutral right against belligerent aggression, and the preservation of the basis of law and order. Whatever the provocation, we shall be too clever to commit the vast stupidity of war, too great to deal in resentments, and too profoundly conscious of American principles and precedent ever to abandon the great task for which an especial Providence has reserved us—the founding of a temple of Jupiter Serenator after the downfall of the Titans.

BRENT DOW ALLINSON.

Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Caution from California

SIR: In the present feverish state of the nation we are in danger of adopting measures that are unintelligent, extravagant and unnecessary. In this situation we look to The New Republic to express the more sober popular judgment. It must protest against coercion of opinion and maintain that open and honest expression on matters of national policy which is at present so much needed. The New Republic should undertake a rational discussion of the problems of national service; it should seek clearly to define the terms universal military training, universal military service, and conscription, so that we may not be led into the adoption of any of them without being conscious of what each represents. It should protest against efforts which, under the plea of military necessity, threaten to impress and abuse labor and labor organizations. It should insist on exemption for the conscientious objector. Finally, the people have a right to insist that any measures which are adopted to meet the present crisis should be clearly recognized as temporary, and should not burden us with an ill considered permanent military system. If the United States is at the close of the war effectively to insist on the permanent basis of peace, to secure which she is professedly entering the conflict, she must not be engaged in building up a disproportionately large army and navy for herself, fostering military ambition.

LEONARD OUTHWAITE
ARTHUR V. POPE
AUSTIN LEWIS
CARLTON H. PARKER
CHAUNCEY W. WELLS
RICHARD F. SCHOLZ
GEORGE M. STRATTON
HERBERT E. CORY
GEORGE R. NOYES
PAUL RADIN.

Berkeley, California.

An Opportunity for Critics

SIR: I should like to call attention to the significant, if obvious, lack of criticism of the magazines. When a book is published or a play presented for the first time, a definite body of criticism renders judgment. Naturally, this judgment is often inexpert or perfunctory. Many a dramatic critic is timid or sparing in adverse comment because he is afraid that candor will offend the advertisers. Many a book review is compiled from the press notices of the book sent out by the publishers. But there are a few publications whose judgment—at least on the more important plays and books—means something. These publications attain a certain critical prestige. To readers, authors, producers and publishers alike they represent the judgment of the day upon the drama and literature of the day. If the sale of a book or the box-office receipts of a play represent its commercial value, so these criticisms, blind or biased as they may be in individual cases, may be generally taken to give some idea of its artistic or intellectual value—which, of course, is its real value. They give appreciable impetus to the sort of work which deserves to endure.

But the magazines, and the contributions of every sort which appear in the magazines—stories, articles, essays, serial novels, poems—meet with no such criticism. There are, to be sure, so-called reviews of the current magazines

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in various newspapers. But these are generally merely copied from the press notices sent broadcast by the publishers, and therefore represent only the rosy views of the magazine editors themselves. Of the reviews actually written in the newspaper office, the majority reveal nothing so clearly as that their author has not read the magazine at all. In the rare cases in which the critics have evidently read what they are criticizing they maintain such a studied neutrality of opinion, and are so timid about showing any preference at all, that it is difficult to take them seriously. As for the regular critical publications, to read them one would hardly know that the magazines existed. They speak of the publication of The Pentecost of Calamity as though it had not already influenced two million readers through the columns of The Saturday Evening Post; they speak of Mr. Britling Sees It Through as though intelligent people did not know that before it appeared in book form this remarkable story had been running for months as a serial in Collier's.

There are a few conspicuous exceptions to the rule of critical indifference to the magazines. Mr. W. S. Braithwaite undertakes an annual compilation and critical study of magazine poetry for the Boston Transcript; Mr. Edward J. O'Brien does the same for short fiction. The eagerness of the publishers to snatch Mr. O'Brien's tabulated lists and to make advertising capital out of them is a tribute not so much to his judgment as to his enterprise; disagree with his findings as one may, the fact remains that he is the only critic of contemporary short fiction who covers enough of the field to be able to speak with any authority at all.

Beyond this, there is no criticism to help the reader, the author, or the publisher. Except for the chance comment of a few contributors and friends, the magazine editor has nothing but his own artistic conscience and the reports of his circulation managers by which to judge the value of what he publishes. If finally he comes to heed only the circulation reports, surely he is not the only one to blame.

In the field of short fiction the situation is especially acute. The short story is a typically American and tremendously popular form of literature. Yet one of the most astute editors in the United States seriously confessed to me one day that he thought the great American short story might be written and come out in a magazine —and we should never know it!

Wherefore this dearth of criticism? Do the critics leave the field untilled because it is so vast? This cannot be the answer; to suggest it is as silly as to suggest that the size of the world is an excuse for not traveling. Is it because criticism of the magazines does not pay? Perhaps. But it seems reasonably probable that if any critical journal undertook to follow the magazines, some of them at any rate would be quick to advertise in its columns. The true reason is nothing more or less than that it has not been the custom to take American periodical literature seriously.

Undoubtedly this situation is one which the magazines have brought upon themselves. But something good may come out of every Nazareth. Many contributions of enduring value appear each year in the magazines. Should not the publishers who put them before the reading public—to say nothing of the authors who write them—have something more than the haphazard and unconcerted support of individual readers?

I conceive it to be the function and duty of critical journals to act as a clearing-house and arbiter of critical opinion. The magazines command an enormous audience. They have great potential power. They are capable of development which shall make them characteristic of the best things in American life. Nothing can help them toward this development so much as the incentive which comes from intelligent and specific criticism, clearly and fearlessly expressed. If the critical journals do not learn to take the magazines seriously, if they continue to pass them by with the scant notice which they have devoted to them in the past, they simply are not on their job.

FREDERICK LEWIS ALLEN.

New York City.

Penology for Prison Guards

SIR: The article by Mr. Quinlan concerning conditions in the New Jersey Penitentiary in your issue of January 13th shows the existence of a very important defect in prison systems. I speak of the lack of education in prison officials, especially the guards. I refer, particularly, to the non-existence of any general knowledge among prison employees concerning criminology, penology, or any of the other 'ologies which may pertain, in any closeness of text or spirit, to the treatment and care of mental or moral defectives. I could safely say that the greatest majority of men employed as guards in prisons never looked inside any of the works of the recognized authorities on criminology. Before prison conditions can be made in the least degree paradisiacal, we must see that prison employees of every station and degree obtain and master, in a sense, the fundamental principles of the care and treatment of criminals. You have struck the spike on the head when you say "many of the guards are lazy and unfair." We should have a marvelous school system in this country if the great mass of our teachers were not lazy and unfair in their treatment of pupils and educational problems. It is unalterably true that the real fulness of life comes only out of a service which is interesting to the individual serving, and to serve intelligently requires adequate education. The whole business has to have a broader understanding and a deeper sympathy among the general public before the sun may dawn upon a scientific penal institution.

ALLEN P. CHILD.

Chicago, Illinois.

Against Militia Officers

SIR: Permit me to endorse E. P. Freeman's eminently fair arraignment of amateur officers in your issue of February 3rd, and to emphasize the fact, too seldom realized, that the failure of the National Guard is in the first instance due to its pernicious system of electing officers without proper regard for their qualifications. At the time of the Mexican War of '48 Grant declared this to be the fatal weakness of our volunteer system, and the evil has grown even more pronounced, until during the recent mobilization I found it the conservative estimate among regular officers at the border that fully 75 per cent of militia officers were unfitted for their commands. Much surprise and admiration were expressed that the rank and file accomplished what they did, and in practically every case their achievement was in spite of, not because of, their officers. Among the latter displays of an almost incredible inefficiency occurred daily and were common gossip in the camps. The vital point which must be brought home to the public is, that while such officers are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a disgrace at any time, in time of war they are a positive danger. Beyond a doubt if the clash had come last summer, scores of good men would have gone to their deaths through the ignorance and unfitness of their commanders. If that element of highly paid incompetence which looks upon the militia as its private pork barrel succeeds in having it maintained in the face of the condemnation of the highest military authorities in the country, both past and present, it is the duty of all right-minded men to labor unceasingly that its two most serious deficiencies be remedied—lack of proper equipment and lack of competent commanders. Of the two the latter is immeasurably the more vital, and constitutes an intolerable menace to that portion of our young manhood which has cheerfully shouldered more than its share of the burden of national defense. With universal service as our ultimate ideal, let us set about at once to secure a sufficient number of men mentally, morally, and physically equipped to command the tens of thousands who must be taught to "do their bit," and to safeguard them while doing it.

"El Paso Experience."

Does Not Expect Early Peace

SIR: Your several editorials on the present crisis in the issue of February 17th appeal to me very strongly, for they express with great clearness and force the views I have long held. Perhaps we may yet act, but I fear that the personal and party temperaments of the present government will never permit us to act with the promptness and vigor that we should. Perhaps the realization which has come to most of us at last, that England *may* be defeated—that Germany *may* dictate the future peace—will awaken our people to the danger which threatens.

I cannot see the grounds for your cock-sureness that peace will come by the end of 1917. Unless the blockade policy of England forces Germany to terms, which I very much doubt; or unless the blockade policy of Germany brings England to her knees, which Heaven forbid; I cannot see what ground there is for anticipating sufficient military progress to bring matters to a decisive issue. With the character of war on the western front progress is certain to be very slow. The same is true on the Italian front. Only to-day we learn that the Saloniki force, which we had supposed to be upwards of three-quarters of a million men, is barely 350,000, whereas General Sarrail insists that he must have 500,000. What Russia may do is wholly problematic, but the Rumanian fiasco has destroyed her opportunity to march upon Constantinople. Equally problematic also is the outcome of the far-off operations in Armenia and Mesopotamia.

So, with the exception of the two possibilities mentioned above, there is no very good prospect of peace except a peace without victory, and that many of us do not want.

H. M. Chittenden,
Brigadier General U. S. Army (Ret.)

Seattle, Washington.

Missionaries Trustworthy Witnesses

SIR: My attention has been called to a most comprehensive and much appreciated statement in the January 27th number of The New Republic on the Armenian massacres. There is one statement in it, however, that makes me wonder why it is made, and that is that the woman missionary from whom you quoted, who was Miss Graffam, a missionary of this Board at Sivas, made her statements perhaps influenced by religious prejudice, etc. I know Miss Graffam well and what she has passed through in the last two or three years, and there is no person whose word I would take as being less prejudiced and less hysterical on matters relating to the treatment of Christians by the Turkish government than Miss Graffam. As to her religious prejudice, she is a warm personal friend of the Turkish officials at Sivas and vicinity. When all the other missionaries were asked to retire from Sivas for military reasons, the governor personally informed Miss Graffam and her associate, Miss Fowle, that if she wished to stay, he would be very glad to have her do so.

I have seen, of course, all the reports of the missionaries sent out of Turkey during the last two years with reference to the massacres, as well as the reports of Germans, official and unofficial, and of the United States Consuls and representatives, and I am very free to say that the American missionaries' reports are more balanced and less liable to criticism and exaggeration than the others.

I thought you would like to have this word, as it may possibly correct your impression of the missionaries. They having lived in the country, most of them for many years, are better able to judge of events and are less likely to misunderstand than others who have been there only a brief period. The missionaries also speak the language of the people among whom they live, and so are better able to understand them than others who do not.

James L. Barton.

Boston, Massachusetts.

One Analysis

SIR: I am not a pacifist, much less a non-resistant; and was impressed with your articles of February 17th on The Time to Strike Is Now. But when I come to analyze the argument so ably presented, it seems to me to amount to this:

1st. Germany should be punished for violence by more violence;—the theory of our criminal procedure and of the duel.

2nd. That we have helped the Allies and therefore must fight Germany—more "mailed fist," of which we accuse Germany and the gentle Theodore.

3rd. (Underlying.) If we don't fight Germany now, we may have to fight her later. Out of the cold frying pan into the hell of fire.

Bolton Hall.

New York City.

Speaking for Eugenists

SIR: Anent your interesting review of Magic in a recent issue of The New Republic I should like to add a criticism that your reviewer omitted. Even an unattached, unregistered, non-militant eugenist must take umbrage at the happy (?) consummation of the play.

As a fantastic figment of the imagination "Magic" is a real joy and a refreshing change from the ordinary play. But when you come to such a matter of fact and important subject as marriage, a man that sees devils—not to speak of controlling them—has no right to marry. Think of the next generation!

Mrs. Israel Davidson.

Palisade, New Jersey.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books and Things

YOU remember, no doubt, the question put by Miss Elizabeth Bennet to her father, after he had read out the first letter ever received at Longbourn from the Reverend William Collins: "Can he be a sensible man, sir?" Part of Mr. Bennet's answer is not relevant here, but you recall the beginning: "No, my dear, I think not; I have great hopes of finding him quite the reverse."

When I picked up Sixty Years of American Life, by Everett P. Wheeler (Dutton, $2.50 net), my ignorance knew nothing about Mr. Wheeler excepting what any one may learn from those anti-suffrage letters which he contributes, at seemly intervals, to the New York Times, and from his eminence at the New York bar. What can you infer about a man from his eminence at any bar, however keen the competition there? Ability he must have, to be sure, for without it he could not have gained and kept such a position. You can infer little else. The color of his character may be anything between hottest scarlet and the most tepid gray. He may believe that this is the best of all possible worlds or "que le bien public est formé d'un grand nombre de maux particuliers." His life may be lived either in humility and self-tormenting or "stately in quiet high-bred self-esteem."

More revelatory than Mr. Wheeler's professional egregiousness were his anti-suffrage letters. Read now and then, on the days of publication, and neither collected, I am sorry to say, nor perfectly remembered, they left an impression that is still distinct. Their author, it seemed to me, must be a man who has heard himself called to a round of triumphs over the suffragists. The terrible ease of these triumphs does not provoke him to mistrust their genuineness. On the contrary. He is tempted to celebrate every letter as if it were a real victory, to beam mildly upon the spectators with a kind of thin geniality.

"Can he be a sensible man?" My answer, with nothing but those letters to go by, was no. I began his Sixty Years of American Life with some hopes of finding him quite the reverse. Before long every one of these hopes was extinguished. I lost first the expectation and then the desire that Mr. Wheeler should provide me, at his own expense, with ill-natured amusement. When I came to his account of the signing of the call which led to the organization of the New York Bar Association, the only passage that almost satisfied my malice, I almost wished that Mr. Wheeler had worded it differently: "Besides the names already given, A. J. Vanderpool, Dorman B. Eaton, F. N. Bangs, Luther R. Marsh, Charles F. Southmayd, F. R. Coudert, and E. W. Stoughton were among the signers. These all have passed to their reward. Among the few founders who remain are Joseph H. Choate, William G. Choate, Julien T. Davies and myself." Yes, the unintentional implication does raise a smile, but this is the only passage of its kind in the book.

How Mr. Wheeler's narrative will strike a reader already familiar with the ground covered I, of course, cannot say. To me, whose memory is such that history is always fresh and new, Mr. Wheeler is very readable. His book is the record of a persistent fight against the spoils system, a high tariff, sloppy and thievish municipal government, the free coinage of silver. It took brains and public spirit and hard work to make these fights count, and some of them could not be made at all without physical courage. A passion for businesslike ways, a hatred of fraud and waste, a determination to supply poor folk with baths and fire escapes—these were among the motives of the early Reform Club reformers. The tasks they set themselves did not call for very speculative minds. In their world it was not difficult for an industrious man with a level head to reach definite conclusions. For them in the midst of their problems the labor of forming an opinion was less than the labor of making it prevail.

Mr. Wheeler is very much at home in this Reform Club world. He has its clear perception of definite things to be done, its readiness to sacrifice time and money, its belief in the efficacy of argument, whether as speech or pamphlet or editorial article. Do not misunderstand Mr. Wheeler when he says "the political experience of New York for fifty years has shown the falsity of the phrase that 'the cure for the evils of democracy is more democracy.'" He is speaking for a short ballot and for giving public officials large powers and responsibilities. Any man who thinks the majority will listen to reason is in his way a believer in democracy. No member of Reform Clubs, no organizer of Bar Associations, can be said to distrust the electorate if he thinks he can persuade it by fair argument to draw its decisions from these respectable wells.

In the Mr. Wheeler who wrote this public-spirited and virtuous book I can see no resemblance to the writer of Mr. Wheeler's anti-suffrage letters. He says nothing about suffrage. He mentions fifteen women in all, and always without a suggestion that their sphere is the home, preferably their own homes. What he says about one of them, who appeared before him in a posture likely, one would have supposed, to give him pain, is even surprisingly sympathetic. He is describing an open air meeting where he made a tariff reform speech: "In front of the platform there had found her way a young woman riding astride on a beautiful black mare. Her riding dress was appropriate. She sat the horse to perfection and managed to keep her steady in the midst of the shouts of the crowd and the music of the brass band." Not one reproving word, please notice, although this young woman was at a political meeting, far from the domestic hearth, and appropriately dressed for straddling. Men have been called tolerant for less notable silences.

No, this Mr. Wheeler is not like the anti-suffrage letter-writer. What is he like? Denied by an inscrutable Providence the privilege of meeting him in the flesh, I can only chance a guess. He is not a writer who leaves a vivid record of himself. If you put him near the Charles Francis Adams of the Autobiography he looks colorless. But would such a juxtaposition be fair? Would not Adams lose a good deal of his color if you put him next to Saint Simon? Nevertheless, if one isolates Mr. Wheeler, and compares him with nobody, his plumage is by no means gay. Its predominant tone is straw color.

In the preface to You Never Can Tell Mr. Shaw tells us that Finch McComas, lawyer, has "a brow kept resolutely wide open, as if . . . he had resolved in his youth to be truthful, magnanimous and incorruptible, but had never succeeded in making that habit of mind automatic and unconscious. Still, he is by no means to be laughed at. There is no sign of stupidity or infirmity of will about him. He would pass anywhere at sight as a man of more than average professional capacity and responsibility." Of Mr. Wheeler I should say that his incorruptibility and truthfulness were not quite unconscious, and his magnanimity not quite automatic. His book is not unlike that which Finch McComas might have written, if Finch had been an American, a believer in the Christian religion, and had felt as sure as Mr. Wheeler feels of his position at the bar.

P. L.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

After the Play

IT is much to ask, yet I crave a few moments' attention while I sketch an exotic tale of domestic complication and infelicity. I present for your inspection a good business man, hearty, robust, with unclouded mind and unjaded senses. He owns a wife who is compact of enthusiasms and whims and megrims. She is very expensive to keep, but our business man can afford her, and by George, she's a daisy! Like King Ahasuerus, the husband loves to display his lady unveiled before the assembled guests, that they may admire and yearn in vain. This adds piquancy to his sense of possession. Nothing exotic in the story as yet. We all know the husband if our power of observation is good, and some of us might even find a clue to him through introspection.

As for the lady, flattered as she ought to be by her prominent position in her lord's inventory of properties, none the less she is often unaccountably restless. She has headaches at will and repulses the kindest and most comforting caresses with a peevish "If only I could be let alone! I'm so tired! I only want rest." Of course the husband knows that this is not what she really needs. She needs to be amused, diverted, and if there is any amusement or diversion to be bought, by George, she shall have it! Such a superb woman, all his own! It goes without saying, all the spinster aunts and pillars of morality in the neighborhood have very definite ideas of this menage. They are all for the husband, such a fine, vigorous, devoted fellow, and against the wife who doesn't know how well off she is. She was doubtless spoiled in her father's home, and has become still more spoiled in her husband's. What she really needs is a taste of hardship, sorrow. Fortunately there is a child, as an additional guaranty to her husband's title. But do you know, she hardly ever pays any attention to the child? It loves its nurse better than its mother. This story is still not exotic, you say. But it is tending toward the unwholesome.

Now I introduce a third character. We'll have him a poet, though I'm sure I don't know why we should represent poets as the chartered wreckers of propertied domestic felicity. The lady's soul opens like a flower to the poet, who is champion of the new morality that renounces property rights and repudiates personal responsibilities. It is a scheme of morality very conducive to vigor and variety of poetic composition. Not a very nice story this, but yet not exotic.

The lady's proprietor, naturally, does not relinquish his rights without a struggle. The traditional morality is hurled at the poet, who coolly parries with the new morality. Physical force is tried, but physical force never leads to conclusive results. The poet would like to effect a rational arrangement by the terms of which surface conditions would remain in status quo and scandal be avoided. The poet, you see, is a prudent, if courageous modern, and while willing to risk an advance beyond the firing line, would prefer to utilize all available cover. The husband might be induced to make this poor best of a bad bargain. At least the form and outward glory of proprietorship would be preserved. But here everything is thrown into confusion by the lady's neurotic whims. She is done with proprietorship, form and substance. She has no respect for firing lines and the greatest disdain for cover. It is a hideous situation for the husband, and as for the poet, rather embarrassing. For responsibility seems about to grip him by the throat.

Let us hasten discreetly through a brief period in which poet and lady drown past and future in present happiness, the poet gradually going over to calculations as to the length of time this sort of thing can still yield literary inspiration, the lady gradually attaining to a knowledge that the new morality is only the negative of the old, equally a man's world product, equally heedless of the depth and delicacy and purity of a woman's soul. In the meantime something like moral evolution is going on in the deserted husband. There was really more in him than proprietary instinct, after all. He has swallowed his humiliation and all he wants is to get his wife back. On her own terms; she may keep her poet, if she desires, he will remove himself from his own home if she demands. Only let her pride not stand in the way. He tries to work on her through the child: to deprive her of it does no good; well, he will be generous and arrange to leave it with her every other day.

"What an exasperating fool that fellow is," comments the poet. "Good Lord, after eight years of married life what more could he have to say to you?" Two months have about exhausted all the poet has to say, and there is new inspiration somewhere else. "But if he really wants you back, why not?" Why not? And why? These two questions, each unanswerable, subsume the whole universe as it presents itself now to the lady. Next morning she is dead, and husband and poet are buying wreaths for her, the one pathetically striving to extend a shadowy proprietorship into the world beyond, the other striving tastefully to express the appropriate emotion.

The foregoing is the theme of Ossip Dymow's Nju, presented at the Bandbox theatre by Urban and Ordynski. I've interpolated the spinster aunts and pillars of morality, partisans of the wronged husband. They really belonged in the play, but they happened to be in the audience instead. The whole tribe of dramatic critics have fled from Nju in horror. And yet it presents a serious dramatic problem of general interest, sincerely handled. It is an interesting production, although far from a finished one. The text really needs further adaptation to the American stage. The acting is uneven, and there may even be some question as to whether Mr. Urban has reached a final distribution of his wonderful lights. But it is not on points of detail that capital charges have been brought against this play.

In their amusements men are more likely to display reactionary tendencies than in any other department of their lives. The theme of Nju is revolutionary and might therefore be expected to arouse the antagonism of the public's accredited representatives. The spectacle of a woman's life crushed out between the old morality of proprietorship and the new morality of irresponsibility is unsettling. It is much more unsettling than a play openly vicious. After all, property is attended in the world by theft. In a sense, theft is a kind of homage to property. Therefore a broad-minded proprietarian may laugh indulgently over a bit of thieving, so long as his own possessions are under lock and key. He can have no indulgence at all for the crime of attempting to reconstitute the basis of property. The peccadilloes celebrated in the more or less pornographic plays on Broadway depend for their savor upon the acceptance of a general scheme of proprietary morality. There is, therefore, nothing subversive in them. Nju neither accepts the proprietary morality nor does homage to it by conduct that any discriminating observer would characterize as vicious. This is the exotic, alien, murky, dank, unwholesome thing in the play against which the critics cry out in dismay and rage.

A. S. J.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Morning After

Potential Russia, by Richard Washburn Child. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. $1.50.

FOR magazines with millions of readers there is no problem so oppressive as the problem of popularization. In talking for effect an editor like George Horace Lorimer of the Saturday Evening Post may pretend to believe that there is no real difficulty in popularization; that if Shakespeare and the bible are at home at street-level, street-level is good enough for anyone; that the important and basic truths are simple truths; that anything which is incomprehensible to a high-grade moron is tainted with Machiavellian subtlety; and that there is nothing of the Yale key about the key to heaven. This sort of platitude is all right for popular effect and in moments of stress it is pleasant to think of ourselves as craving Shakespeare and not William Randolph Shakespeare or William Jennings Shakespeare. But in the privacy of his heart a popular editor knows the hard task imposed on him by the habitual mental unpreparedness of his public. It is true that the public which is reckoned by the thousand thousand has definitely admirable impulses which respond to any writer who meets them. It is also true that with unfamiliar subjects we who read as we run are as helpless as a prince in an automat. The million-public has been led to assume that it has no intellectual responsibility whatever, that there is no topic on earth which isn't ready-to-serve. Having done everything to encourage this assumption, the popular editor is forced on all occasions and with all sorts of material to take predigestive precautions. Having nothing but our minimal literacy to bank on, he is bound to make popularization his main object—and anything which is not susceptible of popularization he must keep out of the way.

This condition has created a great opportunity in widely read journals for special-article writers whose art is particularly the art of presentation. The man who has the gift of elucidating for the public something about which it is compelled to talk without knowledge is in constant editorial demand, in such demand that before he is himself thoroughly informed on one topic he is driven to become interpreter of the next. That, in a degree, is the fate of all journalists, but the peculiar circumstance of the special-article writer is that he has to make much larger pretensions than his humbler brother of the newspaper. In his task of popularization he is not allowed to admit that he has come in as a kind of barrister, to plead a case which someone else prepared. He has to pose as an expert rather than leave exposition to men who may be equipped but cannot popularize. There is danger in this pose, of course—in the plausibility a man cultivates and the oracular style he assumes. The editor wants him to be oracular and plausible, to overpower his audience by his impressiveness, whether it is sturdy mission-oak impressiveness or bright golden oak or mahogany finish. Fact is more important than mere opinion, blunt statement more important than niggling refinement, the man in the street more important than the man in the study. But omniscience and finality, the two modest requirements that a popular editor has most in mind, are not so common as the market demand for them, so the unfortunate obligation is to approximate omniscience and finality, to turn one's turnips into apple-jam.

It was over a year ago that Richard Washburn Child went to Russia for Collier's Weekly and his book is certainly an "old" book by this. It is unreasonable, however, always to appraise books as schoolgirls appraise friendships, in the very heat and height of newness. The quality of a book may reveal itself instantly to the eagle eye, but the ordinary eye sees more after the surface has been nibbled a little by mordant time. Richard Washburn Child is especially to be seen after time has tested him. He knows instinctively how to deal with his national public on vast improbable subjects like presidential campaigns, the newest nationalism, the psychology of Mr. Hughes, Russia the land of the future. To judge him fairly, however, it is better to read him in cold blood. Potential Russia lends itself admirably to this friendly autoptical inquiry because at the time Mr. Child wrote it he had no hesitation at all about announcing what Russia was really like. He had gone "through the length and breadth" of the empire, as his publisher declared, and he dared to interpret. And that interpretation was so definite about a future which is already the past that one is in a position to check up part of the account.

To grasp the boyish simplicity with which Mr. Child proceeded to read the heart of Russia it is only necessary to consider his chapter on the Czar. There was "so much misinformation about Russia outside her borders" that Mr. Child made up his mind to procure information at first-hand, so he decided to "have the opportunity of talking with the Czar." In this particular expectation he was disappointed. The Czar was engaged in the plans for a drive on the southern battle front. But Mr. Child came "into close contact with ministers and staff officers who constantly are close to the Czar's personality and to the peculiar atmosphere which surrounds him." And he

TIFFANY & CO.

SILVERWARE
MADE BY AND SOLD
ONLY BY TIFFANY & CO.

FIFTH AVENUE AND 37TH STREET
NEW YORK

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made his conclusions as to the Czar. "Whatever may be the narrowness of his view, there can be no doubt about his sincerity in wishing to maintain the Russian dynasty as nearly as possible in the state in which it was when he inherited it from his father. He loves his people; if he believes that democratic government is dangerous for Russia, it is because he believes that it is dangerous to stability and not merely that he feels that it menaces the prerogative of the monarchy. To him the dynasty is an heirloom; it must be handed down to the czarevitch as it now stands, not because it is a good thing for a line of emperors, but because he believes it a good thing for the millions of people. The Czar may not be a man of much imagination, but he is a man of much sentiment."

Mr. Child explained the dilemma of Russia, "the old, old dilemma of an autocracy resisting a demand for more complete constitutionalism and constitutionalists confronting the resistance of an autocracy. The dilemma was whether to try a test of strength or to yield. The Czar, having chosen the first, the Duma, the constitutionalists, and the people chose the second. There was not even the glimmer of revolution. . . . Paul Milioukov, leader of the Constitutional Democrats, or 'Cadets,' as his party is called, editor of the Ryech, said to me: 'I am rated as a radical. But no one considers disruption of national unity at this time. The ideas of revolution in Russia which Americans entertain often are absurd. Whatever the future years may bring to Russia, this is not the time for an uprising.' . . . Above all, the empire is impressed with the necessity of internal coöperation. Not for years have the people received so many rebuffs from the autocratic machine, but not for years have they been so willing to bear all in silence. For enemies of Russia to rely upon disruption within is no more and no less sensible than it was for enemies of England to rely upon the troubles in Ulster to split Great Britain's unity."

Where Mr. Child uses his dramatic gift in describing the plight of Russian and Polish civilians he becomes a telling witness to the horror and mercilessness of war. Where he describes Russia's Better Half, the emancipated women with whom he conversed, he is a vivid reporter. But the moment he begins offering oracular judgments again he risks his intellectual scalp.

"Loathsome as the idea may be to many idealists and reformers—and I found it loathsome to Russians—willy-nilly there will develop a Russian business and industrial growth. This growth will have its organization, and this organization will have a clear, even if unpoetic, vision, and its demands for change will be constant. Business will know what it wants, and will go after it. I heard the two Duma Socialists, Tehkheridze and Kerensky, address a meeting in favor of raising no issues of reform until the war was over.

"'And then—revolution,' said another Socialist enthusiast.

"No, not revolution, unless I am mistaken, my friend. Cool heads in Russia believe the idea of revolution is ridiculous. Something less dramatic is in store for Russia. Business! That sordid thing—business. Clear of eye, persistent of purpose, capable of organizing a people back of its demands of common sense—it is Business which will be able to force liberalism on Russia. And it will do this not by revolution but by evolution."

The things that Mr. Child found developing in war-time Russia were the things for which Prussia is famous—coöperative human action, a national sense, national spirit. These things Mr. Child admired. "The war has stuck a rude thumb into Russia's ribs; the pain will help to make a new Russia." But of the Duma Mr. Child reports dubious views. "I found that of the responsible foreigners who have lived in Russia it was those who lived there longest who had most sympathy for the bureaucracy. A commercial agent sent out semi-officially from England to study Russian economics said: . . . 'The bureaucracy is odious to the democratic sense: it is most stupid, but the longer one watches the more one feels that any changes from the present administration must be gradual. And why? Because, in spite of the able leadership of some men, the Duma is not convincing. There is a great variety of divergent views and a wide range of beliefs and programs. Suppose the bureaucracy were wiped out to-morrow—could the constitutional assembly act with such harmony and sense as to give even a safe government to Russia? I doubt it. Personally, I believe it would mean utter confusion. That is why I, who am heart and soul in sympathy with democracy, am also in sympathy with the resistance of the Czar.'"

In reporting these views Mr. Child did an excellent service. In adopting them he simply yielded to the temptation that journalism never fails to present. Potential Russia is in some respects a suggestive and informative little volume. It is brightly written. But it is singularly untrustworthy and misleading on all the real issues involved.

How could it be otherwise? How was Richard Washburn Child equipped to interpret Russia to America? He has the gift of popularization. He writes so that a million people can understand him. But even if he had succeeded in buttonholing the Czar in adolescent American fashion, would he have had the right to assume that he knew about Russia—at first-hand? F. H.

The New Commonwealth

The National Being, by A. E. New York: Macmillan. $1.25.

THIS is a wise and beautiful book. In no sense the work of a scholar, it yet possesses much of what the scholar can contribute to the definition of these problems; while the swift beauty of its intimate revelation gives to it a value that is all its own. It is the new Irish commonwealth which Mr. Russell endeavors to depict. What essentially he is attempting is to suggest its outlines, to sketch the perspective of its architecture, to trace out its soul, rather than to deal in any fulness with the details of patient construction. That is perhaps responsible for the appearance, at times, of a somewhat disturbing theological mysticism one may venture to wish absent from a book that is basically political. One knows, of course, that the transcription of personality to the printed page is an almost impossible task; yet it is still permissible to wish that Mr. Russell had less often taken refuge from its difficulties in a certain cosmic emotionalism which makes his thought elusive almost exactly at the point where clarity is most urgent. But, in the end, the large outlines of his aspiration come home with a fulness and strength that make his book an important contribution to the theory of the state. We have had in the last two years half a hundred volumes on political organization. Of a certainty we have had few so penetrating or so wise.

"The building-up of a civilization," says Mr. Russell, "is at once the noblest and the most practical of all enter-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prises"; and it is the ethos of this new civilization he has sought to fashion in this book. He is searching out a dogma sufficiently beautiful to catch at the hearts of men that they may build upon it the community it is in their power to create. And one says dogma advisedly; for the making of that faith upon which all great action is founded is essentially the discovery of some everlasting yea the forces of criticism are powerless to destroy. Some broad truth of this kind, some truth which to believers has seemed so unchallengeable as to ennoble life, has been at the basis of every great civilization. It explains the passion for scientific veracity which, as Dr. Sanday has recently and finely shown, is the real key to the achievement of German scholarship. It explains the justice of England, the liberty of America, the equality of France, the character of Rome. Some such dogma the new Ireland is to have, if the tragedy of its birth-pangs are to be ennobled by the glory of her youth.

The spirit of coöperation is the dogma upon which Mr. Russell lays insistence. That upon which at the outset as at the end he lays supreme emphasis is the moral urgency of a common service. The old individualism has perished of pragmatic failure. Science has made the world a unity, even if, in the end, it is a unity that transcends our comprehension. With the niggardliness of competition Mr. Russell has no patience. He has seen its bitter tragedies in the ugly history of Irish agriculture. It is with a finely suppressed passion that he speaks of its disintegrating waste. Experiment with coöperation seems to him to have demonstrated possibilities that we dare not as yet estimate. It is not a centralized community he envisages. Rather does he assert that the natural social unit is a locality knit more by geographical accident than complete unity of interest. Only in the former does he discover that fundamentally organic character which is of the essence of corporate personality. "Our modern states," he says, "have not yet succeeded in building up that true national life where all feel the identity of interest." While one does not feel that it is fair to ascribe to the Greek world the discovery of a secret the modern age has lost—for so to do is to neglect the element of slavery—it is yet vital to understand, as Mr. Russell argues, that they who build the new social order, "must think first of the average man in field or factory," if neglect of him is not to wreck its very foundation. One feels, too, that Mr. Russell has truth on his side when he urges that the change we need is one that can not be imposed from above. The lesson the workers have to learn in the primary art of organization they must teach themselves. Only by coöperation in every function of which life demands the performance will they adequately learn it. That is not to say that the task will be easy. Here, as I think, Mr. Russell's pioneer enthusiasm has led him astray. The fundamental test of a coöperative future is the success or failure of trade-unionism. We who are thrilled most greatly by the splendor of its victories in this first century of its history must yet admit that it has barely touched the fringe of its problems. Questions like its relation to church and state, the powers and training of its leaders, the quality of its endeavor—all these have as yet been barely formulated, though Mr. Russell writes with an optimism that deems them settled. And even the rapid success of agricultural coöperation in Ireland must not blind us to its partial failure in other spheres where the experience has been longer and on a vaster scale.

For the history of coöperative effort would seem to suggest that coöperation is more valuable as a distributive

"Mademoiselle Miss"

Letters from an American girl serving with the rank of Lieutenant in a French Army Hospital at the front:

"The record is one of the most intimate and holy things which have been saved for our comfort out of the whirlpool of embattled Europe. I find in these letters some fragment of true atonement for the huge sin and blunder of the war."—**Dr. Richard C. Cabot** in his Preface to this little book.

"This brief record of some of those lights and darks shows not only what she does for her wounded and what her loving care of the wounded has done for her."—BOSTON TRANSCRIPT.

"These letters are not conscious literature but quivering life. They are flung from the ends of her tingling nerves onto bits of paper, in the burning, bloody midst of most tragic and heroic scenes. Nothing equal to them in brilliancy, poignancy and power has come from the European War region to any periodicals."—METHODIST REVIEW.

Published for the benefit of the American Fund for French Wounded.

Price 50 Cents

Ready April 12. Price 60 Cents

The Edith Cavell Nurse

from Massachusetts

A record of one year's personal experience with the British Expeditionary Force in France. Boulogne—The Somme, 1916-17.

With an account of the imprisonment, trial, and death of **Edith** Cavell.

All Royalties to be given to the Committee for the support of the Edith Cavell Nurse in France.

W. A. BUTTERFIELD, *Publisher*

59 BROMFIELD ST., BOSTON

Prompt Attention to All Orders

There is but one WRITING MACHINE *in the full sense of the word.*

A Typewriter does only straight-away copy.

A WRITING MACHINE does every-class of work on the same machine. It is flexible.

MULTIPLEX HAMMOND

MANY TYPEWRITERS IN ONE INSTANTLY CHANGEABLE TYPE CHANGE YOUR TYPE IN A SECOND

It will do all that other machines can do BUT IT STANDS ALONE in the special fields of writing endeavor. For instance:

Business Executives
Because of individuality of work, writing dainty, small type. Refined, æsthetic appearance. Large business type for business letters. *"Just Turn the Knob."*

Literary People
because of its instantly changeable type system, with many styles of type and many languages. Two sets of type always on the machine—*"Just Turn the Knob."*

Libraries
Because it writes cards perfectly flat—without bending. Condenses in miniature type, writes names in large type. *"Just Turn the Knob."*

Social Correspondence—Private Secretaries
because of the dainty small type and high individuality of the work. Its refined and æsthetic appearance, and also the language possibilities.

Professional Vocations, Including Engineers (Mathematicians)
because of having type-sets especially adapted to each class, with all special characters needed; immediately interchangeable.

Linguists
because of having every known language available, all interchangeable, and high individuality of work and capability of writing both Occidental and Oriental languages on the same machine.

College Professors and Students
because of small space occupied; instantly interchangeable type; high individuality of work and condensation.

Factory Rebuilt Machines at a wide range of prices.

Open accounts with monthly payments to those with whom such would be a convenience. Discounts for immediate settlement. Catalogue gladly sent for the asking.

THE HAMMOND TYPEWRITER CO.
550 East 69th Street, at East River, New York City, N. Y.

Please send literature—without obligations

Name.....
Address.....
..... 550

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INTIMATE TEACHING BY SCHOLARLY MEN
Riverdale Country School
A boarding and day school for boys in the open country at Riverdale-on-Hudson, upper New York City. Fourteen acres. Hardy country life, sound college preparation, expert physical training. *Special department for younger boys.*
Address FRANK S. HACKETT, Headmaster
Riverdale-on-Hudson, New York City **Tel. 123 Kingsbridge**

CAMP PENN, ELEVENTH SEASON
Valcour Island, Lake Champlain
A Camp for Boys that is "Different"
Camp Penn is "DIFFERENT" because of its exceptionally high standard of character, because of the individual oversight and small group system, because it is a REAL camp and not a school in disguise, and particularly because the whole system is designed especially to develop self-reliance, initiative self-help, real camp-craft, a true appreciation of the "Great Outdoors," as well as to give each boy a bully good time!
We would be pleased to send you our booklet
Charles K. Taylor, M. A., Director, Chestnut Hill, Phila., Pa.

SPEAK A FOREIGN LANGUAGE!
The War has created unlimited commercial opportunities for those who know Spanish, French, German or Italian. Take advantage of the war situation! Better your position and increase your salary. Extend your business. Establish export trade with South American countries. Equip yourself to read foreign books and papers. Brush up on the language you studied at school or college and make it of practical use. Acquire a new language at home, by the
LANGUAGE-PHONE METHOD
And Rosenthal's Method of Practical Linguistry
(Highest Award Panama-Pacific Exposition)
This is the natural way to learn a foreign language. You hear the living voice of a native professor pronounce each word and phrase. He speaks as you desire—slowly or quickly, for minutes or hours at a time. It is a pleasant, fascinating study; no tedious rules or memorizing. It is not expensive—all members of the family can use it. You simply practice during spare moments or at convenient times, and in a surprisingly short time you speak, read and understand a new language.
Write for free "Language Treatise," particulars of Trial Offer. Easy Payments. Our records fit all talking machines.
The Language Phone Method, 953 Putnam Bldg., 2 W. 45th St., N. Y.

The New York School of Philanthropy
Edward T. Devine, Director
A Two-year Professional Course of Training for Social and Civic Work.
Catalogue with information about fellowships offered for 1917–18 will be sent on request.
105 East 22d Street, New York

Next time you have to patch the back steps, where the water drips down and rots 'em out, tell the man: "Cypress, the 'Wood Eternal' and no fooling!" (Why not abolish the repair jobs this way? Make each one the last repair job in just that spot.)
You remember what the poet Pinkleburg said—"He who looks before he leaps, builds of Cypress and builds for keeps." (No wonder he became immortal.)
Have you written for those books yet? Or Vol. 1?
All-round Helps Department
Southern Cypress Mfrs.' Ass'n
1255 Hibernia Bank Building, New Orleans, La.
1255 Heard Nat'l Bank Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

than as a productive process; yet it is on production that the emphasis of the next half-century is going to rest. Nor dare we underestimate the possible significance of the war in this relation. It must not be forgotten that the method of its finance has given to innumerable workers a stake in the present industrial order which they have never before possessed. The fact of their investment in the belligerent loans may well prove the redintegration of the capitalist system. Not less important is the fact that it *is in theory alone that the interests of the working-classes* become harmonized. All over the world, the unskilled are but in a partial sense awakened to the realization of what their organic unity may accomplish. Even with the skilled workers one has a sense that a certain dangerous delimitation of interest has taken place so that the trade-unionist loves his federation less and his local union more. There has developed, in fact, a corporate sense of property which may well prove not less disastrous than the older individualism. How much coöperation may accomplish towards the unification that Mr. Russell desires, time alone, of course, can prove. But it is not with self-shut eyes that we must set out on such adventure.

Even when this criticism has been made, however, the doctrines of regional economic federalism, of the erection of a system of voluntary groups alongside the state, is intriguing and impressive. It simply cannot be doubted that the old no less than the new, happy and easy confidence in the ability of the state to secure a permanently satisfactory basis for social life is utterly and completely mistaken. The discovery of representative government—which Mr. Russell erroneously attributes to the Anglo-Saxon peoples—has too long been regarded as a political panacea. The fact is that parliamentary government seems to have reached the zenith of its achievement. Nothing is so greatly wanted at the present time as the discovery of new methods of administration. The complexity of social problems has made them too vast for discussion by debate to be an adequate method of legislation. No single chamber has stood the test of this war in any degree well enough to make us hopeful. Everywhere the tendency is more and more towards the development of an invisible bureaucracy until the state itself seems, in the last analysis, no more than what the French, with untranslatable wisdom, calls a *syndicat des fonctionnaires*—a *syndicat*, moreover, which is largely manipulated by men who are completely out of sympathy with working-class ideals. And in this contest it is of the first importance to realize that the movement for social reform is less perhaps a genuine effort towards the complete reconstruction really essential than to a discovery of the minimum conditions of change necessary to the maintenance of the present order. The fact is that the general will of society does not find complete expression either in governments or in legislatures. We are simply forced to the realization that majority government cannot be the last word on our problems. So long as political power is divorced from economic power, the jury of the nation, as Mr. Russell well says, is in reality packed. Wherein representative government has been supremely successful is in the securing of general political rights in which rich and poor alike have been interested; but once the transition has been made from political rights to economic interest the basic sectionalism of society has been apparent to anyone who has had the patience to observe the facts. Wherever economic freedom is to be attained, certainly legislative experience does not give us the right to expect it from that quarter. It is otherwhere that salvation lies.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In such an analysis, Mr. Russell's suspicions of state-interference find an important justification. That is not, of course, to say that he is individualist in outlook. What it means only is this that in the struggle between the Jekyll of the general will and the Hyde of representative action it is not Dr. Jekyll who triumphs. State-action, in short, is tainted at its source. What is to be derived from it is not any radical change so much as a partial diversion of the stream of products which, as in Justice Holmes's fine metaphor, is to be divided among the members of a given society. The state divides less on principle than for the purpose of maintaining obedience to its fundamental rules; and it is away from the consideration of those rules that legislatures divert attention. But Mr. Russell rightly insists that it is essentially with the consideration of those rules that the workers are in fact concerned.

That does not mean revolutionary action. That does not mean a contest between those who operate the machinery of government and those who desire to divert it to new purposes. What in truth it really means is the invention of new machines. The value of Mr. Russell's study consists less in the substitute he has proposed than in the emphasis he has given to the problem. The real business that lies before us is the patient construction of new hypotheses out of the rich experience of the nineteenth century. For our fundamental ideas we shall, as he rightly argues, look backward rather than to our own day. We shall not forget the wealth of suggestion that still lies imbedded in the as yet insufficiently analyzed history of medieval decentralization. From church and guild and commune we have still many a lesson to learn. Men like Nicholas of Cusa, Marsilio of Padua, and the great Chancellor of Paris University, Jean Gerson, have still to be interpreted in the light of our own problems. Gierke in Germany, Saleilles in France, Maitland in England, have given us some sense of what may be learnt from such an interpretation. Mr. Russell's book gives us a renewed sense of their value. He has never laid us under so heavy an obligation as when he turned his poet's gaze to the envisaging of political ideals.

H. J. L.

A Modernist Let Loose

The Tyranny of Shams, by Joseph McCabe. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. $1.50.

MR. JOSEPH McCABE, like Mr. E. Philipps Oppenheim, has written some fifty books; and the earnest solicitations of his friends have persuaded him to add one more. But whereas most of his other volumes were summaries (often very intelligent summaries) of other people's work, the present volume is a kind of intellectual testament. It sums up Mr. McCabe's conclusions upon the vices of modern society. It tells us what he would like to see happen. It enables him to deal faithfully with ideas of which he does not approve, and like most of what he has written this volume is chiefly of interest as the revelation of a curious psychological type, the existence of which is too rarely appreciated in our time.

Mr. McCabe, in brief, is that "candid friend" from whom Canning, in some famous verses, once begged to be spared. A century's experience may not have suggested that Canning was wrong, but that is to argue without Mr. McCabe—one of those people capable of continuous optimism because things are so bad that not even a life-

National Birth Control League

¶ The bill introduced at Albany by the National Birth Control League was defeated the first time for lack of organized support.

¶ This bill will be reintroduced in the Legislature at the next session with the moral support of thousands of thinking and responsible men and women.

¶ Another bill to amend the Federal statute will be introduced at Washington. ORGANIZED WORK IS NECESSARY if this fight is to be successful. We ask you to help by joining the League *now*.

Membership dues $1
Sustaining membership.....$5 and $10

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

MRS. AMOS PINCHOT
MARY WARE DENNETT
JULIET BARRETT RUBLEE
MRS. W. LEON GRAVES
ROSE PASTOR STOKES
MARION NICHOLL RAWSON
IDA RAUH
DR. A. L. GOLDWATER
FELIX GRENDON
MAX HEIDELBERG
MRS. JOHN H. WILLIAMS
LOUISE KNEELAND
JESSIE ASHLEY
MRS. OWEN KILDARE

MRS. MAX HEIDELBERG, *Chairman*

Make checks or money orders payable to the League

280 Madison Avenue, New York City

The Pan-Angles

A Consideration of the Federation of the Seven English-speaking Nations

BY

SINCLAIR KENNEDY

"While the English-speaking world is almost experiencing a new birth through the gigantic struggle in which it is engaged, a book like this has a special interest . . . In view of the demonstration in America just now of as much sympathy with Great Britain as is consistent with neutrality, this interesting work of an American writer will be especially welcome."—*Standard.*

8vo, $1.75 net

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO.

PUBLISHERS

Fourth Avenue and Thirtieth St. New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Exhibition *of* Paintings
by Maurice Sterne
from March 24th to
April 28th inclusive
Bourgeois Galleries
668 Fifth Avenue

THE romance of a minister who urges upon his wealthy congregation Christian justice for rich and poor. An impressive and convincing novel portraying characters each with a strength of purpose that is not to be turned aside, and the reader is carried along as interested in the subject as are the characters themselves. The intensity of the love element and the ideals of the book are handled in masterly style.

THE UNHALLOWED HARVEST
By HOMER GREENE
Author of "Pickett's Gap," "The Blind Brother," etc.
At All Booksellers, $1.35 net
GEORGE W. JACOBS & CO.
PUBLISHERS PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Those Who Have Money to Invest
OR INVESTMENTS
TO PROTECT, Read
THE ANNALIST
Weekly magazine of finance, commerce and economics, published by the New York Times Company, Times Square, New York
10 cents a copy *$4.00 a year*
News of paramount interest to the business man and investor is featured weekly in
THE ANNALIST
SAMPLE COPY FREE ON REQUEST

Uncontrolled Breeding
—or—
FECUNDITY versus CIVILIZATION
A contribution to the Study of Over-Population as the Cause of War and the Chief Obstacle to the Emancipation of Women
By Adelyne More
With an introduction by
ARNOLD BENNETT
And a Preface and Notes by
DR. WILLIAM J. ROBINSON
Price $1.00 (paper 60 cents)
THE CRITIC AND GUIDE COMPANY
12 West Mt. Morris Park - New York

time of constant work will enable him to repair the ills from which we suffer. And Mr. McCabe has the right to tell us of the changes he would introduce because of the vast experience he has enjoyed. Has he not talked to miners in New Zealand, to millionaires at the Ritz and to "great ladies" at Claridges? He has heard rumblings at Tokio and Pekin; tomorrow he may hear them in Teheran and Lhasa. His book shows that he has toyed with half a hundred subjects with that large sufficiency which enables Sunday editors to keep him in stock. He has many of the requisites of a writer. He has (p. 30) the inevitable reference to kultur. Hittites, Dydians, Phoenicians, Babylonians, Romans, Amends and Quichevas —he knows about them all. He knows the Countess Russell (p. 118); he has read Mr. Rountree's book on Poverty (p. 116); he has statistics at his fingers' ends (p. 119). Birth control, freer education, the tyranny of fashion, the stupidity of kingship, the sham of the Church —all the typical arguments you will find here in luxuriance. Phrases like "it is useful to imagine ourselves in the year 3000 or so" (p. 108) drop easily and arrestingly from his pen. He is full of fine little innuendoes and touches of secret information which make you understand (almost without a shudder) that he is the familiar gossip of great men. If Mr. McCabe is not the man best fitted by truth and experience to tell the truth about our civilization, the prophet we so sorely need is not yet born.

And what does he lay bare? The cost of militarism, he tells us, is stupendous. The war might have been avoided by foresight and intelligence. There is a great deal of stupid patriotism which insists on an antique prejudice about weights and measures. The party system has outlived its utility. The distribution of wealth is iniquitous. The poor lead a ghastly existence. We make a fetish of the home. We lay too much stress upon marriage and chastity. The future of woman lies in the direction of an independence which will make great changes in social structure. We teach history and geography and mathematics very badly. We attach a childish importance to Latin and Greek. Public culture is at a low ebb. Music-hall artists become incapable of doing more than look at book-illustrations. Much of our literature is trash. The church is tyrannous, dishonest and ignorant.

What are his remedies? Here, again, what distinguishes Mr. McCabe from all who have gone before is the refreshing novelty of his outlook. What will comfort the reader who has sweated in horror at the above conclusions will be the large sufficiency of Mr. McCabe's panaceas. Militarism must be replaced by international arbitration. We must have an uniform language so that Australian colonials shall not be bothered by the French on the menus of Melbourne. A universal currency will prevent Mr. McCabe from paying continuously for exchange in his vast travels. Bishops must no longer sit in the House of Lords. Majorities must really rule. We must not teach the Bible—"the literature of an ancient, mendacious, polygamous and bloodthirsty tribe"—in our schools. Our museums must be made more open to the public, and their curators must not grow tired through arranging cephalopods. The newspapers must give less space to divorce and crime. We must be free and rational about marriage. We must tell the church what it really is. Then, though there would be no heaven, "there would spread gradually over this earth such joy and freedom and prosperity as men's prophets have babbled of in their dying dream." Prophecy and babble—of these Mr. McCabe is entitled to speak.

H. J. L.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Argument Against War

We challenge those who want war against Germany to answer this, point by point.

1. In consequence of indefensible wrongs committed against us by Germany in her attempt to starve England, President Wilson has declared and is just putting into operation a policy of "armed neutrality." This means the vigorous defense of American ships and American rights on the sea *without involving America in a European quarrel.* We ought not to abandon this policy before we have tried it.

2. Our entrance into the war would lengthen rather than shorten it. The bankruptcy of England and the starvation of Germany together will bring a negotiated peace. But if we go into the war and back up England's credit she will renew her determination to go on until Germany is crushed. This will renew Germany's determination to wage war to the end, and the conflict will be dragged out indefinitely.

3. We cannot destroy German militarism by defeating Germany. Militarism is a condition that can be destroyed *only from within,* by the democratic impulses of the people themselves. France tried to destroy German militarism *from the outside* in 1806. Under Napoleon she crushed Germany more completely than the Allies can ever hope to crush her now. That was not the end, but the beginning of modern German militarism. Fight Germany to a finish, to a "dictated peace," and you will only inflame the military passions of her people and strengthen the power of Prussian tyranny over them.

4. By going to war, we cannot vindicate those points of international law which give us a legal right to declare war on Germany. The whole body of international law has broken down among the belligerents. England and Germany have both violated international law. Nations in a death struggle always violate it. International law cannot be upheld by joining in such a struggle.

Thus without the possibility of doing honor to our country or of shortening the agony of the world, or of destroying militarism, or of upholding international law, we should be entering into war for no intelligible gain whatever.

5. Not only should we gain nothing by going to war, but we should lose our historic opportunity to bring this war to an end by mediation, and to play the decisive part in establishing a secure organization of nations of the world. President Wilson defined the highest aim of this country in his speech to the Senate, demanding peace without victory and a league of the nations to insure peace. If we enter the war our hope of fulfilling this aim is forever lost.

6. Besides losing our opportunity to serve the world we should lose the best of our own possessions—democracy and individual liberty. True democracy and liberty cannot live in a militarized state. Conscription follows war, universal militarization of the mind follows conscription, the suppression of free speech, the enslavement of public opinion, the suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus,* follow that, as they have in every belligerent country. War means absolute command; it means dictatorship. In the effort to conquer Prussia England is being Prussianized, and we should be Prussianized even more rapidly, for the traditions of individual liberty are less anciently established among us.

We are the only great people left who are free from those habits of servile obedience to authority which are the direct result of war and militarism. At this crisis and parting of the ways let us have the courage to stand up for our liberty and independent manhood against the menace of a militarized America. We cannot bring democracy to Europe by going to war. *We can preserve democracy in the western hemisphere* by staying out.

This is your patriotic duty. Uphold the President in his policy of armed neutrality. Hold Congress to that policy. We must act only for defense. Let there be no recognition and no declaration of a state of war.

Write your Congressman immediately that there must be no declaration of war. Telegraph the President.

American Union Against Militarism

If you want to spread this point of view broadcast over the country, send money at once to the American Union Against Militarism, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York. It will be used for nothing else.

(Advertisement)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Town & Country

SOCIETY, COUNTRY LIFE, ART
LITERATURE, RECREATION, TRAVEL

TO cultured MEN and WOMEN of the WORLD it is the indispensable magazine because it represents the best in American life —social and intellectual.

In sumptuousness of production, Town & Country has stood unsurpassed among ILLUSTRATED PAPERS for a quarter of a century, not excepting such famous publications internationally as Country Life of England or L'Illustration of France.

While an intimate personal note runs through all of its pages, Town & Country is never "cheap" nor intrusive. Brilliant departments, such as its notable London Letter, characterized by a world point of view, combined with a background of illustration, cleverly "edited" both as to interest and artistic value, have given this publication an outstanding individuality and prestige unique among all American magazines.

As Town & Country comes to you THREE TIMES A MONTH, it is more complete, authoritative and timely in all of its departments than are magazines devoted wholly to the fields of ART, the DRAMA, AMATEUR SPORTS and SOCIETY, or to COUNTRY HOUSE and COUNTRY CLUB LIFE.

36 issues - $5 a year
25 cents a copy
Read carefully the coupon printed below

Town & Country is never sold at a cut price or with premiums but the COST PER SUBSCRIPTION COPY is lower than that of any contemporary magazine, and the measured value is that of 36 issues against 12, or at most 24, of other magazines.

TOWN & COUNTRY
8 West Fortieth Street, New York

You may enter my subscription for the next fifteen issues of Town & Country and $2.00 is enclosed herewith.

Address.....

The Basic Problem

Self-Government in Russia, by Paul Vinogradoff. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. $1.25.

THE increased interest in Russian affairs has brought forth a multitude of books by English and American writers who are stronger on enterprise and facility than on wide or accurate knowledge. Hence the announcement of a book, on Russia, by the versatile Russian scholar, who is also our leading authority on English legal and social history, may raise more expectation than it can well fulfil. For it is not a thorough treatise that the author of Villenage in England has here attempted, but rather a few popular lectures aiming to give us a general outline of the great changes in the legal status of the Russian masses. Professor Vinogradoff sketches lightly the forces which led Russia under Peter the Great and his successors to adopt parts of European civilization, and he indicates briefly the difficulties which have prevented this civilization at the top from reaching the great mass of the people more effectively.

There is a modern and yet already venerable myth to the effect that all history shows a steady (even if slow) progress in freedom, and that the further we go back the more enslaved we find the people. Those who take this myth seriously had better not read this book; for they will be shocked to find that Russian serfdom of the nineteeth century was not the mitigated form of an earlier slavery, but rather the result of a process whereby a free people were deprived of their rights. Though Professor Vinogradoff is a pronounced liberal, he does not hesitate to show how the aristocratic liberalism of Montesquieu led Catherine II to enslave her people and to complete the cycle whereby the free Russian peasant of the sixteenth became the serf of the eighteenth century, with little more rights than the cattle of the estate. Those, however, who have the traditional fear as to whether the Russians are fit for self-government will be surprised and perhaps encouraged to read of the extent to which the Zemstvos (provincial councils) have carried their work. Professor Vinogradoff shows convincingly how the solution of all the great Russian problems depends on the proper adjustment and development of local self-government.

Contributors

to this issue

WILLIAM HARD is a graduate of Northwestern University, Illinois, and has also studied in England. He has contributed articles on economics and politics to several periodicals and is now on the staff of the Metropolitan Magazine. He is the author of The Women of Tomorrow.

GEORGE SOULE is assistant editor of The New Republic.

CHARLES MERZ is Washington representative of The New Republic.

UNION PACIFIC

Standard Road of the West

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED